

FROM WHAT HAVE STARS TO GEORGE ELIOT:
NAMING, FRAGMENTATION AND IDENTITY IN
THE EARLY NOVELS OF FICTION

By

KARINA LYB ROTH

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2005

Copyright © 2013

by

Katherine Lynn Riddle

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I offer my sincerest thanks to Dr. Patricia Crawford, my dissertation reader, for her direction and devotion to my work and my career. For her editorial comments, her advice, her help in connecting Lacan to Eliot, her encouragement, and her example of academic excellence, I am truly thankful. I would like to thank the members of my committee, all of whom offered helpful commentary on my draft: Dr. Elizabeth Langford, for her insights on the Victorian perceptions of women and women writers; Dr. Chris Sandgreen, for his help in clarifying theoretical applications; Dr. Barbara Toris for her insights on Lacan, and Dr. Ronald Wilson for his historical perspective. I would also like to thank Dr. Elise Langford, who originally inspired and encouraged my interest in the work of Jacques Lacan. I also thank my family: my father, Richard Roth, whose love for me and concern for my work provided me with the word processing tools for this dissertation; my mother, Sonja Roth, who always says a prayer for me; my sister Julie Frankie and her husband Peter for their constant love and encouragement; my sister Carrie Roth, for sharing with me the love of English; my sister Betty, for her encouragement, and my aunt Corinne Kiest for her enthusiastic interest in my work. I also thank my friends at First Lutheran Church in Minneapolis for their Christian friendship and constant prayers. To all my friends who supported and encouraged me through my doctoral

program, I gratefully thank you. I offer my thanks to my friends at The University of Alaska who helped me prepare the final copy of this work: Christopher Bus, Dr. Polly Riside, Scott Baker, and Dr. Bryan Patten.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
CHAPTERS	
1. CHAPTER ONE.....	1
2. MARY ANN STARR, LACS, AND DIVISION.....	7
The Fragmented Subject.....	7
Division from Family and Religion.....	10
Signatures and Almost Signatures: The Case for Longevity.....	13
Forebode to a Pen Name: Lacs and "Division".....	19
Personal Division: What's in a Name, Mrs. Lacs?.....	21
An Attempt to Be Whole: Mrs. Mary Ann Starr.....	26
3. "THE GAS FORTUNES OF THE REV. JOHN HARTON".....	74
The Rhetoric of Sympathy.....	74
George Eliot and the Divided Narrator of "The Gas Fortunes of the Rev. John Harton".....	91
Elisions of Being Whole.....	117
Miss Harton: A Fragment of An Angel.....	120
4. "JOHN'S RESISTANCE".....	131
Sympathy or Sygfy: The Role of the Less Obtrusive Narrator.....	131
Authority, Misreading, and Missing Robert Boucher's Definition of Sympathy.....	157
Joan's New Understanding of Sympathy.....	164

the Attesting and Acceptance of Eyewitness: A Legacy.....	166
2. <u>ADAM SMITH</u>	167
From the Clergy to the Carpenter: The "Large Career" of <u>Adam Smith</u>	168
Smith Harris: A Clerical Forerunner of the "Large Career".....	169
Smith's Mirrors, Illustrations, and the <u>Smith's</u>	170
Recognizing Illustrations: Adam Smith's Discovery of Eyewitness.....	171
3. CONCLUSION.....	172
APPENDIX	
ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	173
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	174
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL BRIDGE.....	175

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the
Graduate School of the University of Florida
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

FROM MARY ANNE EVANS TO GEORGE ELIOT:
MIMICRY, PERSONIFICATION, AND EMPATHY
IN THE EARLY WORKS OF FICTION

By
SARINA EYE BATH

December, 1993

Chairman: Dr. Patricia Crabtree
Major Department: English

George Eliot's early works of fiction have often been underestimated and several remain to be thoroughly examined. The "doctrine of sympathy" which she champions in her early pieces of fiction is fundamental to an understanding of the literary genius which she reveals in all of her novels. This "doctrine" is for Eliot an almost sacred expression of the necessity of human interaction, for she shows that we can only understand ourselves by experiencing parts of another's sorrow or joys within ourselves. This study examines the early pieces of fiction which George Eliot wrote, from *Scenes of Clerical Life* to *Middlemarch*, and claims that Mary Anne Evans' use of the pen name "George Eliot" during this period of her fiction writing career is connected to her use of the "doctrine of sympathy" because she was recognizing the fragmentations of parts of her own self by working with a multitude of names.

This working title came to me in the fiction of

will. She shows the power which naming can claim, and recognizes the difference between naming, which, for herself, can determine the multiplicity of self, and labeling, which can define, restrict, and impose certainty upon one. The present study implements the psychoanalytic theory of Jacques Lacan to illuminate Eliot's own notions concerning subjectivity, too, like Eliot, Lacan sees labeling and certainty as restrictive and psychologically unhealthy. His "subject of certainty," like Eliot's characters who label or impose their own reality upon others, are incapable of recognizing the "other," which, I claim, is the corollary of experiencing sympathy. Those "subjects of certainty" who refuse to experience interactive, sympathetic relationships, often see only the self or the ego, in what Lacan calls an "imaginary" way. This particular theory is parallel to Eliot's portrayal of egotistic characters who can only imagine that they are the center of the universe, and who refuse to recognize others. In order to experience true sympathy, says Eliot, in what we might say is a Lacanian way, one must recognize the otherness of one's self, as a part of one's self, in another human being.

Using this theory to illuminate Eliot's "doctrine of sympathy," we recognize one thread which runs through all of the early works and that is her insistence upon revealing an unspiritual, highly humanistic Christ as a figure who

practices the "doctrine of sympathy" in the most perfect way. Though Mary Anne Evans made a departure from her Christian beliefs at an early age, she still implements the humanitarian aspects, or a part, of the Christian doctrine she was taught.

CHAPTER ONE

With the industrialization of nineteenth century England, the society of people known as the Victorians began to recognize both the opportunities and the consequences which would result in such a drastic move towards modernization. Not only was machinery undermining and changing the labor force, but many people, especially writers, were recognizing a need for the "modernization" of society's attitudes as well. The Victorian literary art of the nineteenth century entered in a multitude of ways writers who were mostly aware of the opportunities which this modernization of attitudes offered them. At the same time, they were acutely aware of the problems which their female predecessors of the eighteenth century experienced as a result of their gender. The pen name or the pen de name became the fashion of the Victorian women writers' movement, for, in order to survive, they felt a great need to veil themselves, to hide their true name and gender behind another name--veils--some of which were obviously masculine, such as Mary Anne Evans' "George Eliot" or Anne Louise Ingram's "George Sand." Other women writers' pen names were more subtly but gendered, such as Charlotte Bronte's "Currer Bell," Emily Bronte's "Ellis Bell," or Anne Bronte's "Acton Bell." As a first step in the examination of "George

Eliza's" early fiction, this study explores Mary Anne Evans' use of the pen name "George Eliot," as well as the multitude of names she used before she chose to write fiction. Furthermore, unlike other studies whose focus is on the oppression suffered in the nineteenth century women writer's need to use a pen name, this study focuses instead on the celebration of names, which the woman Mary Anne Evans recognized, even before she chose the pseudonym "George Eliot."

Examining the many different names she gave herself, including various spellings of her original name, I argue that Mary Anne Evans chose to view her own subjectivity, and then later in her fiction, the subjectivity of her characters, in a way that may be considered as fragmentary and divided. I claim that in this fragmentation, she flourished, for she was a woman who was trying to break away from the Victorian standards of established institutions, such as traditional marriage and fundamental Christian beliefs. In her early works of fiction too, we see that she recognizes the ways in which humans can flourish in their symbiotic relationships with others by understanding the importance of seeing a part of one's self in another. This recognition of the other then leads to the celebration of the multiplicity of the self.

The woman Mary Anne Evans preferred this perception of subjectivity to what modern critics see as a mere

"traditional" perception of subjectivity, such as that championed by signed Freud, which states that we all arrive here and each with a whole, unified, and certain perception of ourselves. Freud's conclusions, though drawn in the late nineteenth century after Eliot's works, provide a stopping stone for an investigation of women subjectivity. Nevertheless, Freud's theories appear to be counterproductive when examining a woman who saw both her self and the others as which she depicted in her early works as "subjects" who celebrated the multiplicity of self. This fragmentary way of seeing one's self as multiple parts rather than as a whole being, I claim, is one way in which Eliot's perception of her own subjectivity allows us to examine her "doctrine of sympathy" in the early fiction. These early works propose that all men and women must have a sympathetic relationship with their fellow men or women. In this vein, I argue that Eliot recognizes the need for her characters to see a part of another's suffering and/or joy within themselves before they can achieve true sympathy with that person. This study turns to the psychoanalytic theory of the post-Freudians, Jacques Lacan, for an examination of the subjectivity seen in Eliot's life and early works of fiction.

This study uses the psychoanalytic theories of Lacan then in order to illuminate Eliot's own "doctrine" concerning subjectivity and sympathy. For Lacan, a subject

who strives for a complete, whole, satisfyingly unified, highly Freudian image of himself, is considered a "subject of certainty," and thus cannot experience anxiety, meaningful relationships with others because of his or her emphasis upon the satisfaction of the ego. If one chooses to see his or her subjectivity in this way, Lewis claims that this person will consider all other forms of subjectivity as whole, unified, and ego-oriented, and will therefore never recognize the "other," which is necessary for meaningful relationships. Furthermore, he claims that the break from the total, unified image of the egotistic self, what he calls the Imaginary realm of subjectivity, is necessary because this image is actually an illusion, or an "illusory" way of seeing one's self. This study shows how, in many ways, Elliot's own perceptions of sympathy and human interaction actually anticipated the work of Lacan in the 1960's and 1970's, in her strong criticism of the ego-centered subject of certainty who has no capacity to understand another or to participate in another's emotions.

The number and variety of feminist critical approaches to Elliot's works are almost as voluminous as the novels themselves. Several writers, such as Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar (Appendix), see Mary Anne Evans' use of a pseudonym as a means of displaying her wariness against patriarchal oppression in Victorian society, while others, such as Hilary Bell, insist that the pen name simply allowed

Mary Anne Evans is wider scope about which to write and conclude that "writing as a woman means writing as a house" (Appendix). While my study acknowledges the difficulty Mary Anne Evans experienced as a female writer in a predominantly patriarchal society, it claims that her use of the pen name was not intended as a means to "get back at" or "even the score" with male writers or writers, but was instead a way in which she could become a part of, not an imposition upon, that society.

Indeed, this study examines the many layers of the woman known primarily as Mary Anne Evans. And while each layer was marked by a name, which left a part of the previous one behind, the layer which is the narrative voice in Eliot's early fiction remains, for the most part, uncertain in its gender. Because Eliot's narrative voice avoided gender roles, and thus the categorization of genders, we see that she was able to examine fully the scope of sympathy. And only when she saw that it was helpful for her to designate her "doctrine of sympathy" did she acknowledge her narrative voice as specifically male. In her first work, *The Life and Fortunes of the Reverend John Barton*,² the narrator's gender is implied to be masculine; the narrator is understood to be another clergyman because "he" can understand or sympathize with John Barton's troubles with his parish. We see this in all three of the early works chosen for examination and always the subtle

implication that the narrator in this had some connection to the narrator's sympathetic relationship with "his" hero. Indeed do we see the narrator recognizably working "blatant" as a man.

The writer we know as "George Eliot" then defies gender categorization, for she defies the certainty which such labeling would imply. Neither specifically masculine nor specifically feminine is the way that she presented herself to the reading public, her narrative leaves open the possibility for both genders to claim it. As "George Eliot," Mary Anne Evans was not attempting to be a man, or to compete with a predominantly masculine society, or to dominate such a society, but was instead attempting to be a part of it, to enhance it, and to thrive in it by recognizing the versatility, multiplicity, fragmentary aspects of her identity.

The Divided Subject

If any author breaks the conventions of gender categorization and the totality of the subject, it is George Eliot. She accepts as stereotypical classification of her life as profoundly masculine or feminine, neither in her personal life, nor in her fictions. It is therefore desirable to find a way of looking at her subjectivity so as to value her the divided, unclassified subject rather than as one that is traditionally feminine, striving to be whole and unified. Such a perspective is available in the works of Jacques Lacan. The idea that the self, or what Lacan calls the subject, is not a total, unified, whole entity was the topic of his early work on the function of the ego. While Lacan built many of his own ideas concerning the self and the ego upon Sigmund Freud's work with ego formation, he disagreed with Freud's emphasis upon the ego's adaptive functions. Basically, Freud believed that the human subject strives to be a healthy, well adjusted individual by adapting to his environment, by seeking pleasure and avoiding pain. "The Pleasure Principle," Lacan's early work on "The Mirror Stage," however, marked a departure from Freud's traditional thinking by placing

sphere upon the individual's need to be in constant conflict with his or her environment. A person who feels he or she is total, whole, and unified, according to Lacan, is experiencing an illusory sense of mastery. The person, the subject, then, must always be divided and Lacan looked at the stages of childhood development to explain this division. According to the lesson Lacan sets forth in 'The Mirror Stage,' a child, when he stands in front of a mirror, wants to grasp and possess his own reflection, because of narcissistic drives. Lacan believes that when the child finds out that this is not possible, that the reflection in the mirror is an illusion of what he thought was his ideal, permanent, stable self, then real development of the ego begins and the subject begins to see himself, as well as others, in a divided and un-unified way. Lacan also says that this way of seeing ourselves is continued throughout our adult lives and is the way in which we will view others as well. We will never have total, whole, unified relationships with others; they will always be somewhat fragmentary. But this is not a tragic view of the human condition; rather, it accepts and celebrates the inescapable multiplicity in what human being. In this light, this chapter will analyze the woman Mary Ann Evans as a divided subject, tracing the ways that she recognizes the divisions within herself. I will argue that, although a traditionally Freudian interpretation of Mary Anne Evans would see her

subjectivity as total, whole, and complete, or as one which claims to be total, whole, and complete, a lacanian interpretation, emphasizing the use of her name, allows us to see her instead as not only a fragmentary subject as [individual] but as an individual who thrives on fragmentation.

The George Eliot Letters, collected by Gordon Knight, indicate that Mary Ann Evans was preoccupied by fragmentation, particularly via names, long before she began her career as a writer of fiction. Two very important events in her life, her break with the strong Christian faith of her family and her decision to live openly with a married man, are indicative of her tendency to avoid and even resist institutions which, for most Victorians, were unquestionably whole and unified: in that they were all-encompassing and unchallengeable. In 1841 she chose to reject the euphoria of her strong Calvinist Christian background and looked towards the beliefs of the teachings of modern thinkers such as Feuerbach, Spinoza, Russell, and Strauss. In this fragmented or split part of her life, when she is struggling with her own religious uncertainties, we shall see these uncertainties surface in her preoccupation with a mark, a certainty, the name "Christian". In 1841 she met the writer and critic George Henry Lewes, already a married man, and in 1844 began living with him openly. A social scandal in her personal life, her highly outspoken, self-

chosen, anti-victorian lifestyle, which also has associations with madness, is characteristic of her bond with totality and will help explain her later break with the totality of a gendered authorship.

As will be discussed, her self-styled "marriage" to Lewis indicates her tendency to "aim whole," to join the part, to go beyond that which is whole, and then to make it into her own reality. Many years before her first piece of fiction, Woman of Fictional Life, was published in 1947, she had already broken those two very traditional conventions.

Lewis's ideas on the divided, fragmented subject allow us to examine her untraditional lifestyle and use of names, and see how Mary Jane Lewis wrote her subjectivity in that which is undefined and uncertain. In The Boy in Purple's Theory, Lewis wrote of the illusion of the totality of the subject:

People spend their time playing on about taking [the subject] in its totality. Why should it be a whole? We haven't the faintest idea. Have you ever encountered whole beings? Perhaps it's an ideal. I've never seen any. I'm not whole.

Neither are you. (194)

And in The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-Analysis, he states, "Freud's method is Cartesian--in the sense that he sets out from the basis of certainty. The question is--of what can one be certain?" (28). If we look at Elliot as a

fragmented subject herself, we will be better equipped to examine, with the help of Lewis, the fragmentary nature of her major male and female characters; that is, to determine which are or are not subjects of certainty.

This chapter will examine the events in the life of Mary Anne Evans which reveal the divisions in her self and will show how in each new division, a fragment of her former self remained. It will also claim that George Eliot as writer was enabled through her fragmentation to communicate the sympathies of divided, struggling human beings in her early fiction, a topic that will be discussed at length in chapter two. Specifically, this chapter will look at Eliot's biography and early correspondence, illustrating the ways in which the woman Mary Anne Evans is divided and fragmented. What was it that introduced division into Mary Anne Evans? Why was that division not only not destructive but actively helpful to her productive and happy life as "Marian Lewes" and "George Eliot"?

Division from Family and Religion

The writer we know as George Eliot was christened Mary Anne Evans on November 18, 1819, at Chilvers Coten, the parish which lies near Arbury Park, Warwickshire. For the sake of clarity, I would like to explain here that the Chilvers Coten Parish Register records her baptism as Mary Anne, and her earliest letters are signed so. In 1827 she

began to sign her name Mary Ann, and in 1838 it became Marian. In 1842 she reverted to the use of Mary Ann. In references to her name, I use the spelling favored at the time. An explanation of the changes in her names will be offered in this chapter. She was the third child of the second marriage of Robert Evans, manager of the large estates of the Meredith family. In 1818 Mary Ann and her sister Christiana were sent to Miss Wallington's school in Exeter. This, the site of her first separation from her brother Isaac, was to be the place where she heard the Rev. John Edward Jones, an evangelical preacher who influenced and greatly strengthened her religious convictions concerning Christianity. Here she also came under the influence of Maria Lewis, who greatly endorsed and strengthened her conviction of the truth of Calvinistic Christian beliefs. Up until 1841 when she met Lewis progressive intellectuals Charles and Caroline Bray, Mary Ann lived an austere religious life. While at Miss Wallington's she discovered her own personal conflict with Christianity and endlessly attempted to resolve it. She knew that the glory for personal achievement was due to God and not to herself, yet she could not control her longing for personal praise (Taylor 21).

When Mary Ann refused to go to church with her father Robert Evans on January 2, 1842, a rift was cracked between the two that was long in its repair. This marked her first

division, its products being her adherence to the Higher Criticism, a creed in which we can see fragments of her Christian upbringing, as well as both partial and complete divisions from members of her family. After nine weeks at her father's story alliance, Mary Anne Evans wrote this in a letter to him, explaining her new views on religion and Christianity.

I wish ardently to remove from your mind the false notion that I am inclined violently to unite myself with any Christian community, or that I have any affinity of opinion with Unitarians more than with other classes of believers in the Divine authority of the books comprising the Jewish and Christian Scriptures. I regard those writings as histories consisting of alleged truth and fiction, and while I admire and cherish much of what I believe to have been the moral teaching of Jesus himself, I consider the system of doctrines built upon the facts of his life and death as to its materials from Jewish notions to be most dishonourable to God and most pernicious in its influence on individual and social happiness. . . . Such being my very strong convictions, . . . I could not without vile hypocrisy and a miserable truckling to the evils of the world for the sake of my supposed interests, pretend to join in worship

which I wholly disapprove. This and this alone I will not do away for your sake--anything else however painful I would cheerfully have to give you a moment's joy. (Letters II 41)

Though her break with her family was more certain and complete, the position she created for herself in this matter was as fragmentary and uncertain as her break with Christianity.

In February of 1812, when, a "holy war" began in the Town's Minster. Mary Ann refused to go to church with her father, a fact which he recorded in his journal: "Went to Trinity Church in the forenoon. Miss Lewis went with us. Mary Ann did not go. I signed the sacrament and Miss Lewis signed mine" (40). In March 4th after nine weeks of Mary Ann's refusal to attend church, Robert Frost decided they should live apart. He had recently moved to a new home at Falmouth, near Coventry, while James occupied the old home at Crick and Mary Ann moved in with her brother. The separation did not last long. A "warlike" was struck: Mary Ann "agreed to attend church with him as usual, and he tacitly conceded her the right to think what she liked during service" (March 21st 41). The fragmentary nature of this father-daughter relationship is evident. Certain and complete separation between the two lasted no more than two weeks. Even during the time in which she was considering her plans of leaving away from her father, she

resulted in a letter to Clara Bow that her only way was
 "that of leaving my dear Father. All else, distant
 lodgings, country visits, and quaking-stocks are quite
 indifferent to me" (Letters I 181).

In 1847, Robert Brown's health began to decline,
 suffering from cardiac symptoms, as was in need of constant
 care, which no other family member but Mary Ann provided.
 She read to him, watched over him constantly, and wrote
 hurried reports on his condition to her brother, sister,
 stepbrothers and stepdaughters. Though the fundamental
 differences in spiritual beliefs between the two sets of
 father-and-daughter were quite different, Mary Ann, like her
 ancestor Maggie Fells (Mill on the Fells), along to that
 child-like connection to her father. Indeed, Robert
 Brown's strict, puritan influence on Mary Ann was so strong
 that her total and complete separation from it was never to
 be. Only

a few hours before his death, Mary Ann wrote these lines
 concerning her father:

What shall I be without my Father? It will seem
 as if a part of my moral nature were gone. I had
 a horrid vision of myself last night becoming
 earthly minded and devilish far more of that
 purifying restraining influence (Letters I 284).

Mary Ann Brown's first divison, then, was as much a
 familial one as it was a religious one, but it was as much a

work of her fragmented self, as a complex "conflict" with her family. It was not, however, a fragmentation in which she thrived. Though she maintained ties with her sister Chissie she "agonized" with her young sister's desire to be an individual² (Taylor 43). Mary Ann's division from her religious background created an unstable relationship between herself and her father and Isaac, greatly dividing the "wholeness" of the family structure as well as confusing her position in that structure. After her father's death in 1849, she left England to take a continental tour with Charles and Sara May, after which she settled in London. During this time, she maintained a mutual relationship with Chissie and with the new siblings Isaac for as long as she could, sending money to Chissie during her illness with typhus. It was much easier for her to correspond with Chissie than with Isaac, and it was the principal break with her that concerned Maria most. She wrote to Sara Remond: "I do not think Chissie will give up correspondence with us in any case, and that is the point I most care about, as I shall still be able to help her as far as my means allow" (Letters II 141). It was three years after she made the bold decision to live openly with the already married Isaac that she decided to make another bold decision she told the news to her family. On May 16, 1857 she wrote:

My dear Brother:

You will be surprised, I dare say, that I hope not sorry, to learn that I have changed my name, and have means to take care of me in the world My husband has been known to me for several years, and I am well acquainted with his mind and character. He is occupied entirely with scientific and literary pursuits, is several years older than myself, and has three boys, two of whom are at school in Switzerland, and one in England.

(Night Biography 218)

Emma remained silent. He stopped personal correspondence with Maria (the name she had appropriated by theft and presented challenge to do the same. The last correspondence she was to have with her brother and sister came in the form of a letter, which was handed to her not by Emma, but by a Mr. Holmsted, the family solicitor, who also wrote the letter on Emma's behalf,

Dear Mrs. Lewis

I have had an interview with your Brother in consequence of your letter to him concerning your marriage. He is so much hurt at your not having previously made some communication to him as to your intention and prospects that he cannot make up his mind to write, feeling that he would not do so in a brotherly spirit....Pardon me to ask when and where you were married and what is the

recognition of Mr. Lewis, who I think you refer to in your letter as being actively employed. [Night Biography 401-402]

To this evidence that Isaac wanted to maintain at least partial, distant communication, Marian responded immediately:

My dear Sir

I have just received your letter written to me by my brother's request, and I willingly reply to it at once. [132]

The letter mentions at length the dissolute Lewis' character and corruption. It received no reply from Isaac and he insisted that Christey break off all communication with her.

Though Marian sought union, visiting was not sustained. Christey desired union as well but was forbidden it by Isaac: thus we see his strong influence in creating a fragmentary relationship between his two sisters. A letter of 1838 is evidence that Mary Ann and Christey had been keeping at least an epistolary correspondence. "I have written to Christey and shall hear from her again" [Letter III 30], writes Marian to Sara Russell concerning Christey's illness with consumption in 1838. Her primary concern was that, in her illness, Christey would not think that she had lost the right of Marian's correspondence from the family. In the same letter to Sara, she writes of Christey, attempting to make justifications for her long silence, affectionately

blaming Isaac for the separation.

I think her writing was the result of long quiet thought—the slow return of a naturally just and affectionate mind to the position from which it had been thrust by external influences. She wrote, 'My object in writing to you, . . . was to tell you how very sorry I have been that I cannot to write and neglected one who under all circumstances was kind to me and mine. My believe (What's emphasis) me when I say it will be the greatest comfort I can possibly receive to know you are well and happy. Will you write once more etc., etc.' I wrote immediately, and I desire to avoid any word of reference to anything with which she associates the idea of separation. The poet is excluded from my mind—I only want her to feel that I love her and care for her. (Believe I'll be emphasis mine)

Christy died March 18, 1888, having corresponded only in a fragmentary way with Maria for the past seventeen years.

Isaac had another chance, and it is significant that it was not until Maria was living in what Isaac perceived as a traditionally "whole" lifestyle that he chose to correspond with her personally. Only when he was informed of her marriage to John Cross did he relent. After thirty eight years of silence he wrote his sister, congratulating her on

what he called the "happy event".

My dear Sister

I have much pleasure in availing myself of the present opportunity to break the long silence which has existed between us, by offering our united and sincere congratulations to you and Mr. Cross, upon the happy event of which Mr. Matthews has informed me. My wife joins me in sincerely hoping it will afford you much happiness and comfort. She and the younger branches write with me in kind love and every good wish. (Letters VII 240)

The epitome of Maria's letter is on marriage, wine, and children. He had made no acknowledgement of Maria's loss when Lewis died, according to Wright, though his wife Sarah had written her a sympathetic letter on that occasion (242).

Maria herself does achieve a partial union with her brother through her depiction of Tom in The Will of the Gods and in her sonnet sequence "Brother and Sister." Though this fragmentary state is not one in which she thrives, it is one which was the model for one of the most loving yet complex depictions of a brother-sister relationship, that of Tom and Maggie Tulliver, in literature.

In the midst of the unending and unrelenting fragmentation she encountered with her family, Maria wrote

to Owen Grey of her need for sympathetic fellowship, (an assertion of her new adherence to the teachings of the Higher Chivalry). "I have no one who enters into my pleasures or my griefs, no one with whom I can pour out my soul, no one with the same yearnings the same temptations the same delights as myself" (Letters I 183).

Her meeting and relationship with Charles and Mary Grey at Woodhill, Coventry, proved to be the comfort, support, and intellectual stimulation necessary for her. This meeting would lead to a much more healthful, thriving frequentation, one full of religious doubts, uncertainties, and unanswered questions, all food for the intellectually hungry woman. At the time that Mary Ann was making her visits to Woodhill, Charles Grey was expounding the virtues of mesmerism, and he later keeps a practice of the then popular pseudoscience, phrenology. Mary Ann participated in these practices as "all visitors at Woodhill were expected to have their head felt for bumps" (Dexter 80). Grey found Mary Ann's large head to be most conducive to study and she agreed to travel with him to London to have her own head cast for study by the nationally known Cornelia Doanovs. The relationship between herself and Charles Grey has been noted by many biographers as a romantic encounter for the young Mary Ann Evans. Indeed, Grey was well known as the "Don Juan of Coventry." It is, however, the intellectual stimulation which Grey offered

that was most inviting to, and most influential for, Mary Ann Evans. He introduced her to the philosophies of Robert Owen, who encouraged and experimented with theories of communal living and free love. Mary Ann found the ideas intriguing but was not ready herself to practice them. Mary also introduced her to the works of Robert Moore, the Irish political economist, the American philosopher, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Irish leader, Daniel O'Connell, and the passionate Reverend Thomas Spencer, who was involved in the Temperance Movement.

It is difficult to give any one name to George Eliot's beliefs after her break with her family, but what is clear is that every religious, philosophical, or theoretical system she chose to follow still kept her perpetually in touch with her original beliefs in Christianity. Positivism, skepticism, determinism, the Victorian version of the 'higher criticism,' (or the religion of humanity), all of these beliefs are attributed to Eliot. Charles E. Morris, one of Eliot's earliest biographers, quotes John Cross, who refers to the uncertainty of her religion. In a 1919 interview with Eliot's husband of one year, Morris writes: "Mr. Cross confesses his inability to ascertain, 'either from her books or from the closest personal intimacy, what her exact relation was to any existing religious creed'" (136). Eliot's uncertainties concerning religion, particularly Christianity, reflect the Victorian frame of

mind, which, according to Walter Doughton, was one that removed the emphasis on man's relationship with God and placed it instead upon man's relationship with man. By their very nature, then, many Victorians believed that human relationships are religious in character (12). As Howard C. Keele says, the 'Higher Criticism' contends that "man knows more of the spiritual and partakes in its life--lives a truly human and religious life--through his relationship with another human being, with a Thou" (49). Indeed, the Victorian frame of mind, which saw all things, material and human, as in a state of constant flux (due to the effects of the Industrial Revolution and the social ills of the 1830's and 1840's which gave more political value to the lower and middle classes), saw nothing, including religion, as an absolute truth (Doughton 12). This spirit of the Victorian Age, its struggles with uncertainty and doubts, indeed, its fragmentary nature, is suggestive indeed of the fragmentary Mary Ann Evans. However, the fact that Mary Ann Evans did not totally discard the values of Christianity, but held on to the fundamental virtues of its teachings, indicates that she maintained a partial hold on to the values given to her by her family.

Signatures and Shared Responsibilities: The Case for Anonymity

In 1840 Mary Anne had a new translation work and recommended Marian for the job. The task was to translate

into English the controversial Das Leben Jesu by the German theologian Friedrich Strauss. It was a formidable undertaking and required two years to complete. The text itself was 1800 pages of German, with quotations in Latin, German, and Hebrew. Joseph Parker, a British politician, initiated the project by asking Charles Kennell to arrange the translation. He told Kennell he would pay the translator generously. Kennell presented the task first to his sister Sarah, who found it too difficult, and the work was later passed along to Faye Herbert, a German scholar, who took it up, but soon carried and found the work to be too much in her new life. Instead they suggested that Maria take over. At the end of the two years she was paid only 50 pounds of the 200 pounds which Parker paid Chapman for the publication. Furthermore, Mrs Taylor states that Maria did not receive any recognition for the Strauss translation and that Parker was suspected of pocketing the money due her [18].

In June, 1848, her work appeared in three volumes. Maria was again immersed in the battle of the higher criticism which had inspired her original division from her religion and her family. The final manuscript of her translation of Strauss's work did not bear her name. The book, in its final form, was published as "The Life of Jesus, Critically Examined" by David Friedrich Strauss. Translated from the fourth German Edition. In Three

Volman, London: Chapman Brothers.² This was another mark, although an almost mark, of her uncertain position, and perhaps a way in which she could avoid signaling to her family what in fact she was doing, though it was not a organization in which she flourished.

In December of 1893, she set out to translate another work of the same theological thought, Ludwig Feuerbach's The Essence of Christianity. As with the Strauss translation, the question arose concerning the way in which the work was to be signed. The cryptic, uncertain way in which the work was announced reveals again the fragmentary nature of Marian Evans. The work was to appear in the Westminster and John Chapman, on June 24, 1894, advertised as ready "In a few days" the Evans and Christiansen by Ludwig Feuerbach, translated from the second German edition by the Translator of 'Strauss's Life of Jesus'" (Emphasis added). On the final proof of the title-page, however, she inserted--for the first and only time--her own name, Marian Evans. Bright conjectures that this move was a result of Leavis's advice (140). What was apparently unneeded exposure, the name attached to the Strauss translation brought an equally unobscured review of her translation, written by James Martineau for the Westminster. In it, he writes candidly and almost disparagingly about the "lady translator."

It is a sign of 'progress,' we presume, that the lady-translator who maintained the anonymous in

introducing Emerson, puts her name in the title-page of *Emerson*. she has executed her task even better than before: we are only surprised that, if she wished to exhibit the new Hegelian *Atheism* to English readers, she should select a work of the year 1840, and of quite secondary philosophical repute in its own country. (1844)

The first critique Martin Evans reviewed of her only work signed with her name, reveals perhaps a reason for her choice to use a pen name rather than her own name in later years. In a letter to Sara Barnwell, she records her response to the review and questions Chapman's preference in choosing Martineau to write it.

About the first thing I said to him [Chapman] was to try to hit in a rage for admitting that disgraceful notice of *Emerson*, which you will readily divine to have excited my ire. When I saw it, I thought Mr. Ch. in his strains had been obliged to put some poor hack of a paragraph-writer in the *Illustrator*, Froese, who knows nothing of the matter. I should have thought J.R. would have done it more cleverly at all events. [Letters 12 518]

Ultimately, it appears that Martin Evans herself shared an anxiety or at least, due to her past experience with exposing her name, found anonymity a place where she

could begin to flourish. While working as co-editor of the Westminster alongside Chapman, she remained an anonymous editor. Knight suggests that she was a person who needed to be needed and was eager to work hard and let others take public acknowledgement for the work, which, he claims, was generally the case when she was working at the Westminster.

Her eagerness to serve others anonymously had been shown long before in her offering to translate Vindicta for Mr. Watts and spouses for charity work, as well as in her extensive working labour over Harriet. She was quite willing to let Chapman pose as chief editor while she did the real work without public acknowledgement. The letters went with the prospectus under the 'the Editors,' of whom Chapman alone was named (21). However, evidence that Marian desired anonymity and flourished from it is this early part of her career writes. Knight's Biography and the George Eliot and John Chapman, a text concerning primarily Chapman's point of view during the years he worked with Marian on the Westminster, both tend to reveal a sign or even a masculinist rationalization of Marian Evans' attempt to be "completely" quiet at her work. Knight's emphasis in George Eliot and John Chapman is upon the emotional difficulties Marian's presence made while she was living at the Chapman residence in the Strand. In the text, Chapman, as owner and financial overseer of the publication, seems larger than life while Marian's role as a worker on the Westminster is

recognized but de-emphasized. It stresses the emotional side of their relationship, and portrays Marian's tie with the Bookman as nothing more than a personal tie to Chapsen. The working editor/co-editor relationship is not seen in this text; in fact, there is little evidence in the text which indicates the extent of her success as a writer or editor at the Bookman. Rather, we read only of Marian's feelings of insecurity during her first (and only) year as editor and then only after a long chapter outlining Chapsen's "domestic difficulties" (30), Marian's failed relationship with Robert Spencer (37-42), and the attempt of London bookshillers (Chapsen among them) to defy the "Regulations" of the Bookshillers' Association (43-47). "Her interest in the living sprang as much from personal feeling for Chapsen as from the need for bread-and-butter" (48-49, 57).

Nevertheless, Knight's text does reveal the unusual circumstances which occurred in the Chapsen marriage room, just before Marian took the position at the Bookman, and may provide an understanding of her choice to remain unmarried, though it is evident that she did not choose as a result of the sterility. Chapsen's interest in her intellectual powers and their common interest in words and literature left his wife Susan bitterly jealous of Marian though he already had a mistress, Elizabeth Tiller, who eventually acted as governess in the household. In the

midst of which was already a "manage a family," Marian, who had sincerely enjoyed the affections of John Chapman, left the Strand and found lodgings in country. However, it would appear that Marian's desire to remain an unpaid editor and assistant had much to do with the slightly contentious relationship with Chapman and the other women living at the Strand. Both women were jealous of Marian and she and Chapman knew it. After leaving the Strand in March 1884, Marian continued her professional relationship with Chapman, when she was assisting in the publication of an analytical catalogue of Mr. Chapman's Publications. Her desire to remain a loyal, quiet assistant in this project--not a self-sacrificing woman--is evident in this letter written to him in April.

On further consideration I consent to continue the Catalogue, since I am assured of perpetual vexation, on condition that you state or rather, I should hope, justify to Mrs. C. the fact that I am doing it, not because I 'like,' but in compliance with your request. You are aware that I never had the slightest wish to undertake the thing on my own account. (Letters I 340)

Furthermore, a letter to John Chapman in which she states, "I am quite willing to agree to your proposition about the nominal editorship, or to anything else really for the interest of the Series (Letters I 341), a letter to Charles

May stating her proposal to "write a review of May for the Westminster not for money--but for the love (Letters I 346), and one to take May in which she declares of her work on the Westminster, "I am training myself up to any odds to all delights, I care for nothing but my work and doing it well" (Letters I 342), all reveal the enthusiasm, energy, and desire behind the unnamed editor of the Westminster. In Taylor, whose more recent biography (1999) offers a truly striking feminist approach to her life, argues that Maria's eager acceptance of her second identity as editor and of a low paying salary were the products of her position as a woman attempting to succeed in a patriarchal society. Of her contract with the Westminster, she states, "Maria never contemplated turning it down because she was desperate to get a foothold in the writing world" (87). Indeed, her anonymous position as an editor appears to have been one she not only did not resist, but desired, if only for the sake of necessity. This was not a position of anonymity in which she flourished; she wrote no essays for the Westminster while she was its editor and answering to Thomas Paine. "Though she must certainly have contributed brief reviews to it, there is no evidence to identify more than a few of these" (13).

Maria Paine occupied not only one, but two unnamed positions at the Westminster when she was not the unnamed editor; she was an unnamed writer of many of the journal's

Finest criticism and reviews. Letters written to her closest friends, the only people to whom she revealed her status at the Reichsanzeiger, show her desire to remain an anonymous writer for the journal. As a precondition to the review, she chose to issue her articles unsigned and this choice had much more to do with her caution in keeping her gender a secret than in keeping in good standing with the Germans. The Reichsanzeiger, like many of the journals of the time, was written for men and by men. According to Gillian Beer, Maria Franz often "seems to have welcomed the anonymity which gave her the freedom to range with authority" (44). In expressing her opinions, in relaying her experience with the weak quality of novels written by women (her "Ugly Novels By Women Writers" appeared in 1894), anonymity gave Maria Franz extra blande. And as in 1898, the primarily male reading public was each told statements as this concerning the poor quality of novels written by women, not knowing that the complaint itself was in fact written by a woman.

The foolish vanity of wishing to appear in print, instead of being substantiated by any seriousness of the intellectual or moral degradation implied in female authorship, seems to be encouraged by the extremely false impression that to write at all is a proof of superiority to a woman. (44)

Indeed, in reaching her audience and convincing them of the concerns she had about the credibility and the moral lapses behind women writers, her anonymity proved an effective tool. Her readers accused her plans days from a man. The fear that she would lose her anonymity is suggested in a letter she writes, with a note of anxiety, of her surprise that Harv Russell had attributed a specific section to her authorship. "How can you be imagine I did the Berlin letters in the Magazine?" Mrs. Russell did then in usual--and she begs Mr. Chapman not to take this work from her at present" (Letters II 188). And in 1838 she writes to Charles May, who had guessed that she was the author of the lively article assailing the religion of her childhood, "Evangelical Teaching: Dr. Cumming." She does not deny her authorship but specifically requests that he not reveal it, for fear its impact would be lost if its readers were to know a woman wrote it.

Since you have found out the "Cumming," I write by to-day's post just to say, that it is mine, but also to beg that you will not mention it as such to any one likely to transmit the information to London, as we are keeping the authorship a secret. The article appears to have produced a strong impression, and that impression would be a little weakened if the author were known to be a woman. [Six words deleted.] I have had a letter

addressed to "the author of article No. 4,"

hoping as to print it separately for "the good of mankind in general." (Letters II 218)

This is perhaps an early indication on one of Marian Evans' later choices to use a pseudonym, a pseud form of anonymity, as anonymous authors are unknown (from the Greek anonymos), and authors using pseudonyms are using false names (from the Greek pseudos, false, and onyma, name), through a similar effect is still achieved; that is, the author still remains unknown. This is a period of her life in which she wrote prolifically and well, producing eight long articles for the Westminster, which appeared in the "Belles Lettres" section between July 1856 and January 1860 (Pinner 3). She wrote far beyond other journals during these years and though all of her articles are unsigned, more than sixty have been positively attributed to her (vii). Not as a journalist for the Westminster, Marian Evans' anonymous position did not necessarily offer her the opportunity to thrive in this part of her career. Though she was a prolific journalist, it was not journalistic writing, but fiction that was to bring her success. This particular position, however, led her to another position of anonymity which did allow her to grow and flourish.

Excludes to a Fan Letter: Love and "Vision"

The extent to which George Henry Lewes influenced

Marion Jones' writing career is immeasurable. Her influence and began not only when he encouraged her to write fiction, but as early as their first years together when Jones was visiting and editing for the Leader, and Marion was writing for the Westminster. The Leader was a radical and liberal weekly which Jones, together with Thornton Leigh Hunt, founded, managed, and edited. Hunt covered political and general news, while Jones was responsible for the literary section, review of books, theater, music, and arts.

That Jones first used a now gendered pseudonym herself, the name "Fivian," (a name used by both men and women) while writing for the Leader, suggests the influence he had on her when she eventually chose the pseudonym "George Eliot" for herself. "Fivian" was responsible for several sections of the Leader: the Arts, Literature, and a section entitled "Portraits" which was often whimsically entitled "Fivian at the Water Cure" or "Fivian Portraits," depending on the theme of the article. The readers of the Leader had grown accustomed to "Fivian's" witty articles and reviews, which were often playful, as in an article on Fivian's trip to Portsmouth where he reported on the great British ships, the Victory and the Neptune. In it, he addressed his audience: "Good Night, Reader!" and went on to comment on and question the moral nature of Admiral Nelson, whose bravery on the Victory is commemorated by a small plaque that reads "Here Nelson Fell" (1841), something which Jones found

redubbed. "Virgil's" popular articles were gossip, as is illustrated in this passage from the article, which implies that Wilson's scandal had more to do with his being a "body's man" than the reader might think.

I mean that Wilson would not have been the hero he was without his love. The evolution of his families, the rustiness, schismatically feeling forgetfulness of soul, the heroism of the man, was infinitely connected with what every a weather-beaten old comrade would consider his "weakness." (1812)

George Lewis then had appropriated a pen name, and divided himself by name, was doing exceedingly well. In fact, when he became ill with a serious neurological disturbance in April, 1894, the name "Virgil," along with his articles, disappeared. In April 29, 1894, under the Leading's section entitled The Asia/Easter Festivities, there is inserted, presumably by Hunt, a one-line black space, at the bottom of which is the following:

* * * * * VIRGIL.

Will our readers believe it? Virgil, whose sobriety has shocked us many times, has now surprised himself, and, with reckless emotions, has sent the above asterisks as his copy? We learn that the unfortunate culprit is penitent; the brilliancy of the reason has been too much for

him: he has gone to 'Tivie and pastures me' to
 remark He cannot do better than publish
 the hint, as one of Tivian's most characteristic
 contributions. (189)

"Tivian" was a success, as much Mark Twain felt compelled to
 explain Tivian's absence to his readers.

Many, if not most, of the articles in the lander, like
 those in the Wichitanian at the time, remained unsigned. A
 few were signed with full names and many were simply signed
 with initials. However, the lively, witty, unmistakably
 unclass Tivian was a regular, recognizable signature. I have
 also discovered that like "George Eliot," who chose her
 name, partially out of her admiration for George Eliot, the
 pseudonym George Leves chose for himself was apparently the
 product of a desire to pay respect to someone he loved. On
 September 28 of 1855, it is recorded that Leves' brother,
 Edward, died at sea. Edward's wife Susan and their son
 Tivian, who George Leves helped financially, are mentioned
 frequently in Leves' letters (Letters II footnote 2).
 Leves' nephew Tivian was apparently the model for the
 recognizable pen name in the lander. It is also important
 to note here the similarities between the names Marian and
 Tivian, both with obvious names, both similar in spelling,
 and both now gone.

Previously, we have seen that Marian Evans' division
 through anonymity did not necessarily allow her to flourish

as a writer, but from April, 1894 through July, 1894, Marian wrote the much needed articles for Lorne's column in the Leader while he recuperated from his illness. Then, she placed herself within his own division. While her articles still remained unsigned, I will argue that this particular division from her name, one which produced anonymity again, did allow her to flourish and also offered her an example of a pen name one being a writer chooses. Lorne's "Vivian" was certainly popular, as it was missed so during his absence.

First, that this was a job she wants to do is evident in this letter to Sara Bray: "For Lorne is ill and he ordered not to put pen to paper for a month, so I have something to do for him" (Letters II 189). Moreover, we see in her Leader articles the beginnings of what would later become her greatest article "Kitty Bonola by Lady Bonolista" published in the Evening Star two years later. The following is an excerpt from an article in the Evening Star entitled "Three Novels" whose authorship has been attributed to Marian Evans by Carson Knight (Biography 181).

Although it is quite true that the indy-novellists are, if not the best, among the best, it is equally true that the female pen is capable of writing a very bad novel, when willful women set their wits that way. (184)

I contend that at least one of the articles in the Leader which was written during Lorne's absence, though

assigned, was written by Marian Evans herself. The style of writing changes in the "Portfolio" section of the paper, which typically belonged to Lewis, in May, 1844.

Furthermore, the articles written under the "Portfolio" section tackled subjects which were such were in line with the subject matter which Mary Ann Evans would tackle later in her lifetime writing career. Victor's articles, particularly those written under the "Portfolio" section, had a markedly lighter, humorous style--until May of 1844, when Lewis was ill, and even "Victor" tells his readers--was recuperating at the water cure of Badens, Switzerland. However, in the May 26 article, we see what would later become Mary Ann Evans' concern with morality, particularly morality as it is defined by the Church of England. The article, noting that even Bishops of the Church are not divine, is concerned with whether they are "decent." "It suggests doubt whether decency has not turned back upon itself and somehow been converted into indecency. The one thing which appears to give unity and vitality to the distracting law of decency, is a strong sympathy with the leading rule of life" (471). Though unquoted, I believe there can be little doubt that Mary Ann Evans wrote this article for Lewis, as the central theme of her early lifetime concerning clerical life was to question the morality of clerics, who, by definition, were supposed to maintain morality, but who instead were quite immoral, as Mary Ann

Fraser's collection, because they had an sympathy with their fellow human. The fact that she did not sign her own name, as the name "Fyvie" in Fraser's absence, reveals that she respected his claim to that particular name.

Her work on the Lantern was made to yield double returns: the books she reviewed for the Lantern were often ones she was able to review a second time for the Westminster, though as Thomas Finney points out, her reviews of the same books for both journals show that she was careful not to repeat herself (4). Though the Lantern was a weekly journal and the Westminster only a quarterly, which meant that she had more time to work on the Westminster articles, it was the Lantern which offered her a much wider range and more interesting variety of subjects than any other London periodical (8). She wrote thirty-three articles for the Lantern, her topics ranging from German philosophy to Greek tragedy, from Milton's doctrine of divorce, to translators and translations. That many of her articles that were written for the Westminster found their way into the Lantern as well seems likely since the Lantern offered more space and a more eager acceptance of her subject matter.

However, under this division, there is evidence that Maria Fraser was more willing to take credit for the articles she wrote for the Lantern than those she had written for the Westminster. There is no evidence that she wrote

her work on the ledger to remain clandestine, a marked difference from her previous strategy, as seen earlier, ever having been discovered as the writer of the Examiner articles. Indeed, it appears that her association with Leves made her more eager to announce that their connection to one another extended into their papers. On February 23, 1878, a year after Leves' illness and his return to the ledger, she writes to Sara Bennett:

By the way, if you should happen to hear any one
imputing articles in the ledger to Mr. Leves, be
as good as to say that he only writes the summary
and general reviews, and that he has nothing to
do with the editorship. Sometimes there is an
article of mine in, sometimes one of his. (Letters
II 218)

We see none of the clandestine use of names to indicate authorship as we did with the Examiner articles, as "author of article no. 4," as fearful acknowledgments to friends that she was so associated with specific articles, and no disappointment that she has been "found out." Though her articles still remain unsigned in the ledger, she does more easily and openly claim authorship, yet only to her friends, of the articles she writes for the journal in Leves' absence. Only to her friends, specifically to Sara May and Sara Bennett, did she refer to "Walter" and Leves as one and the same, a fact that was to be concealed from the general

public. For example, to dare Kennedy she writes, "Vivian has not been well" (Letters II 148) and after Lewis' return to the group, "Vivian's head is not likely to be up to the pitch of Fourthth, as it will have to fall to the lot of some other non-leading stricks of the leader" (Letters II 185). Divided from her name once again, her anonymity produced a sort of protection to Lewis' own divisions her willingness to help kept "Vivian" alive during his (Lewis') absence. The division also enabled her to note the success of the Lewis/ "Vivian" division and through "Vivian," Marian Evans discovered the power in the division ends by a pen name and would eventually use one herself.

Personal Division: What's in a Name, Mrs. Lewis?

Perhaps the most striking example of Marian Evans personal, not professional, division by name occurred when she changed it to Mrs. Marian Lewis. Before we look at that important time of her life, however, it is important to examine first the many names she used in her personal correspondence before she met Lewis. Mary Anne Evans never clung to the name given her at birth and agreed to have a propensity to reveal the divisions in herself by changing her name frequently. These changes were as slight as differences in spelling and as striking as the appropriation of a friendly, rural nickname. The significance of names plays an important part in the analysis of the split subject. Like Lewis's split subject, Julia Kristeva's

theory of proper names reveals much about the writer we call "George Eliot." Indeed, the writer used so many names that it is difficult to pin her down to any one name. Brinkens first looks to Edmund Russell to determine the function of proper names: "the proper name does not designate the same thing for two interlocutors, or at two different moments" (216) and like Russell, Brinkens does not believe that there is any fixity to proper names. "The fragility of the proper name when it comes to fixing a signified identity is shown first of all in the multiplication of proper names" (216). In Mary Anne Evans' case, we see the writer's name change many, many times and almost as often as her identity changes.

Indeed, what seemed to be the gag of Mary Anne Evans' division from her family, though she had chosen to divide herself from them much earlier, was her decision to change the family name given her at birth from Mary Anne to Mary Ann (a much slighter change) to Marian. This latter decision took place when, after her father's death, she decided to take a continental tour with her friends the Weyns. According to Knight, it was during her Swiss sojourn that she changed the spelling of her name from Mary Ann to Marian (75). Indeed, the name she was christened with, Mary Anne, was a combination of two of her father's mother's names, Mary and Anne. Her choice to use the single word "Marian" as her name, in place of her original, family-given name,

the one given her at birth, may very well be interpreted as yet another mark of her division from her family. Furthermore, the importance of the issue of names, as it was related to her family's religious beliefs, was revealed in her translation of Frenchback where she expressed herself so eloquently that Sara Hennell advised her to omit those lines (concerning names) from the final manuscript. "You can rip the heart out of the body and still be a good Christian--but you must not meddle with the guts (emphasis mine); only in the same way the modern Christian any correspondence with the old" (qtd. in Wright *Biography* 141). This line did not appear in the final manuscript. Her break with her religion and her family, which often were inextricably intertwined, meant for Maria a break from the mark that signified that religion--the name "Christian." If we look at the phrasing of this particular quotation, we see it also signifies Maria's partial break from Christianity; she makes a clear distinction between the "modern Christian," perhaps the "religion of humanity" she had recently embraced, and what she called "the old," quite likely a reference to the Christian faith to which her family belonged.

She meddled with her own name constantly, however, and one would find it difficult to tie simply one name to the woman who wrote some of the greatest novels of the Victorian era. From Mary Anne Evans (and the various forms: Mary Ann,

Marion, Marian) to Mrs. Marian Lewis to George Eliot to Mary Ann Evans: any one signature accompanied that which makes the daughter, the sister, the lover, the author, and the wife unmistakable. "George Eliot" refused to play any one of these roles plainly; there is not one specific mark for this one figure of the Victorian era. Her love of language and language play, seen in her early letters, for example, reveals the multiplicity of her subjectivity via the use of nicknames. Many friends from her childhood home in Warwickshire called her Polly or Fanny, while other friends referred to her as Clementia. The habit of appropriating names which held significant meanings became a trend in Mary Ann Evans' letter writing as early as 1840. The first appearance of these rather symbolic names occurred in the late 1840's and early 1850's when Mary Anne was corresponding with her friends Martha Jackson and Maria Lewis. Martha was intrigued by Madame de la Tour's Le langage de Fleurs, which inspired her to offer Mary Anne the name "Clementia," meaning "mental beauty." Martha used the name "Try" which signified "constancy." For a time Mary Anne called Maria Lewis "Marceline," meaning "fidelity in friendship" (Letters I 40-41). In it, she appropriates the natural characteristics of growing foliage for both herself and Maria, offering her regrets for not having responded to her friend more often. Moreover, she does not record the place from which she is writing, but instead designates the

address of the letter as "The Tower of Silence" is keeping with its "lady" tone.

My dear Ivy,

If you knew how the tendrils of your civilities have been twisted out of their natural inclination, you would not wonder that she should concentrate all her sap for her own support under this reckless promise, and thus become stunted instead of stretching out a branch to cling even for Ivy. At length, however, she invites fellow conspirators....to try whether the same soil and air will suit the constitution of both. (Letters I 48-49)

It appears that all of the names Mary Anne Evans appropriated for the use of her correspondences by Leslie have a particularly friendly, familiar tone about them, some were indicative of her rural upbringing while others reflected the intellectual, self-educated side of her. "Polly" had long been a nickname for "Mary," and in 1848, Mary Anne's friend, Sara Russell, transformed "Polly Ann" to "Pollice," a poetic pun on "Apollisius," the angel of destruction. She had become familiar with this name during her work on *Discourse*. Surely, such names which Mary Anne Evans appropriated reflected a meaning which was related to some facet of her personality. Always aware of her audience, she carefully chose and placed a signature, a

name, which revealed a specific side of her self to that reader. She seemed instinctively to recognize that there was never one, unified, whole, certain Mary Anne Evans, but rather a multiplicity of Marians, Felices, Follies, and Mary Anns, + perceptions Lewis enabled us to appreciate.

Of all the names Mary Anne Evans used, no other has more rebellion, controversy, and determination behind it than the beloved name she treasured for years. The self-appropriated one, Mrs. Mary Ann Lewis or Marian Lewis was that name which signified for her a true if not a legally sanctified marriage. She insisted that she be called by this name after her mysterious union with George Henry Lewis in 1844 until his death and her marriage to John Cross in 1849.

Marian Evans first met Lewis in 1832. She had come to London and had taken lodgings at the Chapman Boarding House on the Strand, where there began the series of events which would enable her to meet Lewis. This was a year of hope for England and there was no better place to be than in London where Queen Victoria had commissioned the opening of "The Great Exhibition of all Nations," which displayed a vast array of British and colonial goods as well as goods from other foreign parts, all representative of the mid-nineteenth century pride felt in Britain. In the midst of this, with the encouragement of Charles Bray, Marian Evans found herself seeking work. Bray also recommended to them

publisher John Chapman that Marian review a book by Charles Wesley for the Ecologist.

Ironically, the person she was seeing most when she met George Henry Lewis was the elder Herbert Spencer, sub-editor of the Ecologist. They were seen together often, as part of Spencer's duties included reviewing theatrical and opera performances. They took long walks together and Spencer visited Mary Ann twice during her holiday at Broadstairs. According to Haight, she was "madly in love" with Spencer who considered her "the most admirable woman, mentally, I ever met" [7]. Spencer, however, felt he was "wasted" for earnings. Haight also notes that they remained good friends, often seeing each other, and that once, on his way to visit her, he met George Henry Lewis and invited him to join him on his visit. This happened several times and on the third or fourth time, when Spencer went to leave, Lewis said that he would stay [7].

Since Lewis was a well known, well established editor and writer, Marian was well aware of the fact that he was a married man when she met him. In 1841 he had married Agnes Purvis, by whom he had a daughter and four sons. Their daughter lived only two days and the youngest son also died in infancy. A year later Agnes bore another son, whose father was Thornton Leigh Hunt, the friend with whom Lewis had founded the Ecology. For the sake of the child, Lewis allowed him to bear the legal name Edward Lewis, but in

1843, after the birth of a second child to Matt, Lewis refused to regard Agnes as his wife. Having previously condemned his wife's adultery, Lewis was unable to obtain a legal divorce. In September of 1844, Maria decided that she would move out of the Chaguan boarding house to seek a quieter place of residence. In a few weeks, she located lodgings for herself on Cambridge Street, on the north side of Hyde Park. George Lewis was spending most of his time with Maria there, bringing his work with him during the day. According to Lee Taylor, it was the birth of Agnes' third son to Matt that seemed to "endow the morality of their nontraditional union quiet." While she was indeed keeping their nontraditional union quiet, Maria did relay to her closer friends the happiness she was sharing with Lewis. It is understandable that she would keep such a union unannounced and unnoticed to the public, and though her words on the matter are sparse in her letters, they truly express the love she felt for Lewis. On her thirty-fourth birthday in November 1843, she writes to her friends the Bays: "I begin this year more happily than I have done most years of my life" (JOURNAL II 127). In another letter to Ann May in April 1843, she expresses not only her affection for him but a penetrating understanding of a man very different from what the world was seeing. She writes:

Mr. Lewis is especially kind and attentive and has quite won my regard after having a good deal of

vituperation. Like a few other people in the world, he is much better than he seems--a man of heart and conscience wearing a mask of hypocrisy. (Letter II 34)

The couple were determined to treat their union as seriously as any other married couple's and settled upon the traditional makings of a marriage by celebrating a six-week honeymoon in Germany, during which time Louis conducted research for his upcoming book on Goethe's life. From Weimar, Maria did "report" back to London, anticipating the excruciating depression their departure had made. In the following letter she appears most concerned to convey the fact that Louis, while separated from his wife, was still carrying the responsibility for his children. She writes to Charles Kings:

It is possible that you have already heard a report prevalent in London that Mr. Lewis has "run away" from his wife and family. I wish you to be in possession of the facts...Since we left England he has been in constant correspondence with his wife; she has had all the money due to him in London; and his children are his principal thought and anxiety. Circumstances...have led him to determine on a separation from Mrs. Lewis, but he has never contemplated that separation as a total release from responsibility towards her. (Letter

II. 128)

When they returned to London, Marian did meet with disfavor concerning her choice. Perhaps the mark of her "unwieldiness" choice was to reveal the division in herself via her name she had decided she would no longer refer to herself as Miss Marian Evans but as Mrs. Marian Jones, although she had to to mark the division in her "self" in this way, Marian's letters reveal the difficulties she experienced in convincing friends and acquaintances to accept this new "self" and the name attached to it. Mary insisted on referring to her as "Miss Evans" instead of "Mrs. Jones," as is indicated in this letter to Sam Russell.

Mr. Jones wishes me to write again--though I think it hardly necessary--to say that if Mr. Peel comes to see us--and we shall be very happy if he will do so--we hope you will impress on his memory that he must ask for Mr. Jones and not for Miss Evans, as a misunderstanding on this matter would be very painful. (Letters II: 228-229)

What she had chosen to do by living with a married man and appropriating his name was not only highly unusual, assumed by Victorian standards of propriety, but was also scandalous. In essence, she was announcing to the world that she and James were committing bigamy, as the first Mrs. Jones, Mrs.

Agnes Leves, was his legal wife.

Perhaps their "marriage arrangement," then, was Marion and George Henry Leves' way of striking back at an outdated legal system which would not allow Leves a divorce in the first place. Indeed, an unsigned article on the inconsistencies in the English law of divorce mysteriously appeared in the partisan during the time in which Marion and George Leves were both writing for their respective journals. One must wonder whether either one or both had a hand in writing it about the long, tedious, costly process of obtaining a legal divorce in England at the time affected both of their lives greatly. In fact, the article stresses the point that under English law women have a much easier time obtaining a divorce than men, a frustration that was keenly felt by Leves. Most importantly, the article is from the point of view of a husband who is trying to obtain a divorce from an unfaithful wife. It outlines and presents as facilitating the procedures that the law allows a "husband whose wife is unfaithful (and who) shall be entitled to a complete divorce . . . (and how he is) to achieve that object" (187).

The first step which a husband is thus compelled to take to obtain his freedom, is one revealing to every man of honour and high feeling. He must appraise his wife, put a money-value on the sanctity of his hearth and the purity of his bed,

perhaps the price of the infidelity, in the form of
 damages is an action of crim. con., and extent by
 law what he would be eternally disgraced by were
 he to accept it voluntarily offered" (134)

Marion Lewis' letters during this time reveal his
 determination and frustration of a woman dividing herself
 from the legalistic workings of an outdated system. She was
 no longer using friendly, familiar, rustic means to present
 a particular image of herself as she did in her younger
 days, but instead was insisting that she be called "Mrs.
 Marion Lewis," a striking representation of what was then
 considered a highly immoral, unsocial, and by English law,
 unlawful living arrangement with a man who was already
 married. She set with outrage fire even her closest
 friends. Knight notes that in particular her friend George
 Cooke was horrified that "the noblest woman I have ever" was
 living in sin with the fiercest opponent of polygamy. []
 Cooke asked Charles Bray if there was looseness in Marion's
 family, for he could see no other explanation for her
 conduct (Knight Letters II 213-214). Furthermore, once
 Bray, her most devoted friend, broke off correspondence with
 her for a year. In a letter of September, 1854, Marion goes
 to great lengths to explain and justify to cure the
 relationship she has with Lewis. She first expresses her
 important her friendship with him is and then solicits her
 support by reminding her of the sacrifices in friendship she

has already suffered due to her ties to him.

If we differ on the subject of the marriage laws,
I can at least believe of you that you adhere to
what you believe to be good--...light and easily
broken ties are neither what I desire
theoretically nor could live for. Women who are
satisfied with such ties do not act as I have.
Some--they obtain what they desire and are still
invited to dinner. (Reflections from Letters 100)

Concerning her relationship with Lewis, she attempts to
convince Cass that it is not immoral and that even though
the public is outraged by the arrangement, she is quite
happy.

That any cowardly, unambitious person who is
sufficiently acquainted with the realities of life
can pronounce my relation to Mr. Lewis immoral I
can only understand by remembering how subtle and
complex are the influences that would opinion.
But do remember this, and I indulge in no arrogant
or uncharitable thoughts about those who condemn
us, even though we might have expected a somewhat
different verdict. From the majority of parents,
of course, we never looked for anything but
conformity. We are leading no life of self-
indulgence, except indeed, that being happy in
each other, we find everything easy. (103)

The letter is signed simply "Marion," indicative of the care she took so as not to stir more outrage. Gordon Wright receives a letter that indicates that the reputations of Marion Evans and George Lewis were both subjects for gossip, and not just in England, but in Germany as well. The following is an excerpt of a letter from the Irish art critic John Ruskin to Ottilie von Guericke, the daughter of Johann von Guericke, whose life Lewis had researched and written about in his Life of Goethe.

The story of Lewis and his wife is true, I fear. The lady who is with him I have some doubts her [known] liaison with him. She is first-rate in point of intellect and science and ethicalness of every kind, but considered also as very free in all her opinions as to morals and religion. There are I think certain duties not to be thrown overboard . . . I do not well understand how a good and conscientious woman can run away with another woman's husband. (Letters II 201)

Despite all, Marion maintained the claim she had as George Lewis' "wife." In the years between 1814 and 1817, her signatures to her letters fluctuated between "Marion," "Marion E.," "Marion Lewis alias Peiry," "Marion Evans Lewis," and simply, "Mrs. Marion Lewis." Perhaps the most vibrant claim she made to her "married" name was made in a

letter written to her friend George Parker, an abolitionist of the up and coming woman's movement in Britain who also had a proclivity towards writing poetry. The letter indicated a powerful desire to break any connection with the name "Fanny" and its tone also suggests that those who considered true friends will recognize her as "Mrs. Leves." This letter refers to an incident which occurred when Marian and George Henry Leves were visiting the office of the Wentley Journal, where George worked as editor.

You must please not call me Miss Fanny again. I have remarked that some and do not seem to be known by it in any way. It is Mr. Leves' wish that the few friends who care about me should recognize me as Mrs. Leves, and my Father's Friends send me receipts to sign as Marian Leves, so that my adoption of the name has become a matter of business. (Letter III 304-305)

The letter, almost ironically (considering its purpose), is signed "Marian E. Leves," the "E" seemingly indicating "Fanny," an indication of her need to retain, still, a fragment of her former family life. Yet it would appear that Marian was accomplishing several things here. Perhaps she was subtly yet very cryptically indicating to George that the offense was not as serious as the tone of the letter implied, that she herself clung to her family name, if only to the smallest extent. Furthermore, Marian knew

that Emma was an aggressive Socialist who wanted her to keep her own name, not one that signified her devotion to a man, married or not. And as she indicates in her letters to both Emma's father and John Gray, she was very much in need of any friendly support she could find. What seems to be most revealing about her retaining the "Emma" part of her name is that we can again see her fragmented self. She is at once both Marion Evans and Marion Lewis. Still keeping a slight yet noticeable hold on both her family name (with the mark of the "P"), once changed to retain a fragment of that former part of her life, and keeping the unmistakable "Marion" of her early career as translator, editor and journalist, a fragment of a fragment, she worldwide claims "Mrs. Marion E. Lewis" as her rightful name. Though the middle initial "P" was to gradually disappear in her later correspondence as 'wife' to Lewis, the name "Mrs. Marion Lewis" was affixed to the majority of her personal, though not professional, correspondence even after Lewis' death. These names represented her love for and true connection to George Lewis, her slight yet notable connection to her family, as well as her claim to her earliest professional name, Marion. It appears then that the woman who was christened "Mary Anna Evans," up until her marriage to John Cross, was anything but a whole, unified being.

AN ATTEMPT TO BE EMMA WIFE, MARY ANNA CROSS

In 1880 Marian Lane, 'widowed' from George Lane since 1878, appeared to make an attempt to be whole by legally marrying the young John Walter Cross, a banker and financial adviser whom she had met during her early travels with Lane. Theirs was the epitome of a traditional, acceptable, legal and altogether whole marriage. The wedding itself showed the traditional trappings of a legal arrangement she never shared with Lane. Lady John, who attended the ceremony, described the bride of sixty years:

George Eliot, old as she is, and ugly, really looked very sweet and winning in spite of both. She was dressed in a short dark soft white walking dress with a lace wrap half shading the body, a costume most artistically designed to show her slenderness, yet hiding the squareness of age . . .
 . . . (187)

Though she never showed any sorrow or regret in having chosen to marry Cross, her journals and letters seem to indicate that the marriage was more a state of convenience, something which would alleviate her loneliness, a marriage as unlike the fulfilling arrangement she shared with Lane. In the day she had decided to accept "Johny's" third proposal of marriage, she records in her journal simply "My marriage decided" (Night Diary 344). A letter to Mrs. Emma-Jane announcing her marriage indicates her loss of losing her friendship, echoing the same fears she had when

she had chosen to become Lewis' wife. "If it alters your conception of me so thoroughly that you must.... regard me as a new person, a stranger to you, I should not take it hardly, for I myself a little while ago should have said that this thing could not be" (Letters VII 304). Indeed, she does not speak of John Cross in this letter without mentioning Lewis: "I am going to be married to Mr. Cross whom you may sometimes have seen here. He has been a devoted friend for years, much loved and cherished by Mr. Lewis [emphasis mine] (Letters VII 304). This letter is signed "M.E.L.," one of the last marks she would make as Harriet Beecher Lewis.

Indeed during the seven months of her marriage, the signature to all of her recorded letters is "M. A. Cross;" it appears that she had not only gladly accepted her new, legal name, but the mark of the "M. A." seems to indicate her earlier connection to the name her family knew her by, Mary Ann. (This is in opposition to her use of the name "Martha" which she specifically appropriated during her years with Lewis.) There was a great outpouring of responses from acquaintances she had from her childhood. Cross, as mentioned earlier, had made contact with her, first through his lawyer, and then finally in a congratulatory letter he had written himself. He did not attend the wedding, however. A letter from her niece, Emily Clark, reveals the way in which the family values both

appreciated the unity of the traditional marriage institution and totally ignored any respect for an acknowledgment of her long, happy life with Aaron. "I am sure you would not marry anyone not worthy of you....Could you only have all the happiness I wish you! It is a great comfort to know that you are no longer leading a lonely life, but have among you will love and care for you," (letters of her nephew's wife).

Ironically, the "May to December" marriage between the sixty-seven year old Mary Ann and the forty year old John Cross lasted exactly that long. They were married in May, 1846 and Mary Ann died in December of the same year. Her death was sudden and quick, the result of a kidney infection which rapidly worsened. In an examination of the fragmented life of a nervous female writer, it seems appropriate to note that Edith Simon records that on the day of her funeral, a young child asked her, "Was it the late George Eliot's wife was going to be buried?" (qtd. in Knight *Elizabeth Stod*), mistaking the gender of the author for the gender of the deceased.

Professional Writings

The Connecticut Farmhouse and the Birth of "George Eliot"

Marian Evans began writing fiction in 1839. Upon George Lewis' encouragement, she wrote "The Sad Fortunes of the Rev. Isaac Martin," the first of three short stories or

novelists which make up the collection Pages of Marianne Life. This first section will contain the following: how Maria Lane came to choose the pseudonym "George Eliot," and the problems she had convincing those who read her early works and knew her that she was not the author; it will state that the experience of mistaking her right to be judged fairly, or sympathetically, caused her to write about divisions and fragmentations in her characters which is now covered then with the noble ability to have sympathy with their "fellow creatures."

Moved by Maria's ability to portray pathos--"We both cried over it," she writes in an 1843 journal entry--and convinced dialogue--Lane sent the story to the publisher John Blackwood, claiming that it was a manuscript written by a close friend of his. Blackwood took to it immediately, saying he would like to see more of the series before he put it in print. That Lane's experience as an interpreter was a asset. It was clear to Maria Evans that she did not want to present her work to the public under her own name, fearing it would be judged on the basis of her gender. With Lane and Maria Evans felt strongly about this and in a letter to Blackwood, Lane attempts to convince him that anonymity could be an advantage to the success of the novel, referring to the response Charlotte Bronte's Jane Eyre received after her identity as Charlotte Bronte, the woman, not Currer Bell, "the man," had been revealed.

Your own experience must have shown you the immense advantage there is in mystery about authorship. Let the public [know] that Smith and not Brown wrote a certain book, and although both Smith and Brown are equally unknown to the said public a certain chance is lost. When Jane Eyre was finally known to be a woman's book the same estimate changed. Not that I believe in the possibility of anything adventitious hurting a good book, but there is always something temporary in the success of a novel, and one way we will secure all adventitious aid. (Letters II 504)

The challenge had begun. Under no circumstances did Marian Lewis wish her own name to be attached to the first edition of the gynaece. Yet direct correspondence had to be maintained between publisher and author and the frustrated Blackwood was forced to refer to his promising writer in his earliest letter to her as "My dear anon." The letter's manuscript reads "To the Author of *Race Nation*" (Letters II 218). At this point all that Blackwood knew of the author had come from Lewis: the writer was a "dear friend" of Lewis' whose manuscript, "*Sketches of Clerical Life*," as he writes to Blackwood, "was submitted to me by a friend who desired my good offices with you" (Letters II 248). In her first letter to Blackwood, Marian writes of her desire to be known only under a pen name.

Whatever may be the success of my stories, I shall be content to preserve my incognito, having observed that a pseudonym secures all the advantages without the disadvantages of reputation. Perhaps, therefore, it will be well to give you my prospective name, as a bait to throw to the sharks in case of curious inquiries, and accordingly I subscribe myself, both and most apologetically of editors,

Yours very truly,

George Eliot. [1851]

Marian Evans' attention to using her own name has been discussed in earlier sections of this chapter and I argue that her use of a pen name to indicate the authorship of her fiction is another fragment of her former self, as a pen name is a partial form of anonymity.

Of course, the name 'George Eliot' in and of itself indicates one of the most striking examples of the divisions Marian Evans recognizes within herself. The name is obviously gendered and perhaps indicative of the masculine part of Marian Evans' life, a part she chose to appropriate out of a need for professional survival. When it came time to publish Romola, for example, Marian aggressively pursued a new publisher, Smith & Elder, who had recently begun the new magazine Fortnightly, which had an abundant amount of money. According to Taylor, "Smith & Elder ... had been

working both Leases for years in the hope of setting the real price: George Eliot" (174). Ten thousand pounds was offered and George Lease was given the post of literary adviser for the Longhill, yielding a 'pleasant salary of two' for minimal work (174). Indeed, after the great success of Adam Bede, Marian reported to disheartened, "You know how important this money question is to me. I don't work the world to give me anything but my books except money" (Letters III 141). Moreover, her business women made her one of the wealthiest writers in London, second only to Dickens.

It is important to note that Marian Evans appeared to have kept the more masculine, professional part of her life very much divided from her more feminine, personal life. Though she was no beauty, it is important to note that Marian Evans Lease was reported to have been quite "womanly," according to those who met her. Charles Smith records a meeting between George Eliot and a Mrs. Henry Field, from Massachusetts, who spoke of her womanly nature: superior as she is to the thousands of her sex, she is still one of them with a nature thoroughly feminine. Though she has thought and written on subjects which require a masculine understanding . . . and is accustomed to the society of men who are occupied with scientific studies, still in her heart she remains the true woman. (qtd. in Smith

[118-218]

This quotation perhaps describes best the masculine/feminine division within Marian Evans. A nineteenth-century observer, Mrs. Field noticed even then this important division, though what seems to strike her most is Marian's femininity. Indeed, Lewis' name, who, for all practical purposes, had been abandoned by Agnes Fervie, referred to Marian as their mother or, more affectionately, called her "Mother." What may be considered the most feminine of names, she often begged to her friends that she and Lewis had "a great boy at home who calls us 'Mother,' as well as two other boys" (qtd. in Elsie 100).

Throughout the past century of Eliot criticism, many explanations have been offered concerning Marian Lewis' choice of the specific name 'George Eliot' to use as her mark of authorship. As we shall see, the pseudonym itself has not frequently been considered to have been based on one whole, complete name; indeed, it is often recorded as a partial combination of many Georges and many Eliots. The clearest explanation comes from Marian Lewis herself, who, we learn from John Cross, chose the name 'George' for its connection to George Henry Lewis and 'Eliot' principally for its sound. Cross records in his Life: "My wife told us the reason she fixed on this name was that George was Mr. Lewis's Christian name and Eliot was a good, smooth-sounding, easily pronounced word" (George Eliot's Life I 218). More

recent biographers have, in speculation, offered several examples which may have led her to choose the name, though the following are examples of other 'George Eliots' or 'George Elietas' that would have led her to appropriate the whole name, first and last, at once. Iva Taylor, for example, notes that "there was a George Elliot [sic] [who] had been clerk in a neighboring parish which her father had dealings with" and that a "George Elliot's Close" was shown on one of the old maps of Chilvers Cote as where Marian grew up [23]. Gordon Knight notes that in the October 1833 issue of the leader which announced the birth of a daughter to Agnes Lewis, there is also listed in the same column, the birth of a daughter to the wife of a Captain George Elliot, B. S., of 108 Cambridge Street (Illustrator 140). Though neither Taylor nor Knight offer commentary, it appears that Marian's acquaintance with the name and its various spellings went back as far as her childhood, revealing again how she kept fragments of her past life in her present. Furthermore, her choice of 'George Elliot,' in accordance with Knight's findings, was perhaps an indictment against Agnes. Having given birth to an illegitimate daughter who would later receive financial support from herself and Lewis, perhaps Agnes was being dismissed as a mother; Marian Lewis possibly saw herself and then, George Elliot as better mothers and later made that connection with her lineage.

It is important to point out that there were other

pseudonyms 'George' and 'Elizée' with whom Maria Leves was acquainted. The following examples reveal the more divided way in which the pseudonyms may have been chosen. In Paris, the great novelist who devoted her's clothing and lived openly with many men, Juvénie Lucie Dupin, had taken the pen name George Sand and was thriving in her career just when Maria Leves was beginning hers. The similarities, of course, are many. They were both novelists who often dealt with rustic life, they both lived openly with married men, and both used masculine pen names which were in part 'George.' However, both women chose part of their name to pay tribute to their respective lovers/ "husbands": Maria chose 'George' for George Leves while Lucie Dupin chose 'sand' from the first half of the last name of her companion Jules Sandeau. Felicie Thompson, in her essay "The Two Georges," claims that one of the reasons Maria Leves chose the pen name 'George Eliot' had much to do with the fact that she was aware that "such a pseudonym would invite comparison with George Sand. Although the latter was no longer, in 1844, the talking point she had been in the 1830's and 1840's, she was still the leading French women writer and a figure of personal interest" (134).

Having recognized the problems "George Eliot" experienced after the posthumous authorship of Jane Eyre was revealed, Maria Leves was not unfamiliar with Charlotte Brontë's own desire to mask her identity and therefore was

familiar with Jane's desire to work hard. Though I have found no evidence in Eliot's life or letters that reveals a connection between Marian's chain of pen names and Jane's alias, it is interesting to note that in chapter 24 of the novel, when Jane arrives destitute and penniless at the Rivers' home, she asks the Rivers that they call her Jane Eliot. "Anxious as ever to avoid dissimetry," after having learned that the man she was to marry was already married to a widow, Jane's need to disguise herself has much more to do with Victorian morality and pride than it did with either Broome's or Eliot's more basic need to disguise their gender. Indeed, both George and Marian never disclosed the novel, claiming that the problem posed by the anonymous heroine was not important enough to justify the suffering the hero and heroine must undergo, a theme Eliot was to deal with in her early fiction. In a letter to Charles Bray in 1848, she writes of the novel, referring specifically to the anonymous:

All self-sacrifice is good, but one would like it to be in a somewhat nobler sense than that of a discoloured law which stains a man's soul and body to a putrefying carcass. (qtd. in From Life I 184)

Nevertheless, 'George Eliot,' like 'Carter Hall' before her, was discovered. By the time her second novel Adam Sedgwick was published, many of her fellow writers had detected a woman's hand in the novels, and members of her family and

friends from her youth recognized the rustic scenery of Worsfoldham: the towers, inns, and churches, as well as places of the clerical figures and family members which had found their way into the novels.

Such open connection made between himself and 'George Eliot' she flatly denied. For example, in 1854, after the success of Roman of Clerical Life, she attempts to 'unswindle' Charles Bray that she is writing a novel when in fact she had already begun Jane Redg. "I wish you would not set false rumors....about me. Several people....have spoken to me of a supposed novel I was going to bring out. Such things are disagreeing to me" (Letters II 461). Indeed, all of London was buzzing about Roman of Clerical Life, attempting to discover who the mysterious 'George Eliot' was. It was Charles Dickens who first detected the gender of the author and who wrote to Eliot, using the courteous salutation, "Dear Sir."

In addressing these few words of thankfulness to the creator of the mad fortunes of Anna Barton, and the mad journey of Mr. Millic, I am (I presume) bound to adopt the name that is pleasing that excellent writer to assume. I can suggest no better one but I should have been strongly disposed, if I had been left to my own devices, to address the said writer as a woman. I have observed that even to me to be such womanly

teacher, in those moving fictions, that the assurance on the titlepage is insufficient to satisfy me, even now. If they originated with me women, I believe that no man ever before had the art of acting himself, mentally, as like a woman, when the world began. (*Letters* II 424)

So moved by Eliot's work, or perhaps out of sheer curiosity, Dickens made this request: "If it should ever suit your convenience and inclination, to show me the face of the man or woman who has written me obsequiously, it will be a very memorable occasion to me" (424). Her reply to Dickens was made indirectly through Blackwood whose sympathetic response to her work reveals for the first time a desire to drop the "incognito."

. . . I am so deeply moved by the finely-felt and finely expressed sympathy of the letter, that the iron mask of my incognito seems quite painful in forbidding me to tell Dickens how thoroughly his generous impulses has appreciated. (424)

Indeed, the impulse behind Eliot's first and very rare expressions of a desire to be openly revealed as the author of her works appears to be the sympathetic response they received.

Nevertheless, she did receive responses that were anything but sympathetic, though not unflattering, which practically forced her to reveal her identity. Her brother

James, for example, said that no one but his sister could have written Adam Bede for there were things in it about his father that she must have written (Litham II 36). Writers in Bunsdon recognized the Red Lion Tavern in Willy (from "Jacob's Repentance" in George) as their own local tavern. Her characters were so realistic that much of Bunsdon had recognized their town and the people in the first four serialized works. In the middle of this, a man named Joseph Higgins, who was from Bunsdon, came forward and claimed authorship of all three of the stories in George as well as Adam Bede. An unknown Higgins named Anders spoke on his behalf, writing to Blackwood: "Do you know that you have been publishing a capital series of stories in the Magazine, the clerical houses, all about my place and society" (qtd. in Litham II 187). Various exchanges between Blackwood and the Higgins' supporters, one including a sample of George Eliot's handwriting, ensued, and soon the Higgins matter died out.

But what had happened as a result was the stirring up of gossip. Herbert Spencer was the first person to show Karoline Lewis injudiciously extracted the secrets of her pseudonyms. Spencer then told Chapman, who began writing a string of gossip articles questioning the identity of "George Eliot." In 1858 this same paragraph appeared in an article in the weekly Times column of the Magazine:

It is time to end this potter about the authorship

of 'Adam Bede'. The writer in it is no more a 'great unknown' (sic) than Kate, if bright in parts, and such as a clever woman with an observant eye and unshocked moral nature may have written, has no great quality of any kind. Long ago we blotted our impression that Mr. Liggins, with his poverty and his pretensions, was a specification, got up by George Eliot . . . Mr. Nicholas, it is true, answers for Mr. Liggins but who answers for Mr. Nicholas? Liggins, Eliot, and Nicholas are like Harry Esq., Henry Esq., and Mrs. Barrow. Roll all three into one and you turn up a rather strong-minded lady, blessed with abundance of shrewd sentiment and a profusion of plain words, but kept for sale rather than for use. Would Eliot, Nicholas, Liggins,--enter, (let us say, at a guess,) Miss Briggins. . . The author's attempt to mystify the reading public...is itself the decisive proof. No woman of quality ever condescended to such a game--no book was ever permanently helped by such a trick. (188)

By the time she had written The Mill on the Floss, most readers knew that 'George Eliot' was a woman and an artist like the one above did not help conceal her identity. Nor was the harsh and patronizing criticism easily accepted by

Eliza, though she was not seeking accolades for her work, but a sympathetic understanding of it. "Fiction is as much less sweet than comprehension and sympathy," she wrote in 1839 (Letters III 148).

One final mark of Eliza's need for a sympathetic response was the novella "The Lifted Veil," which she wrote in 1840, interrupting her work on The Mill on the Floss to do so. On one level, the novella is a postmodernistic, gothic tale which ends with a ghastly blood transfusion which essentially brings a dead woman back to life. On another level, however, it is a work, I believe, which expresses Eliza's frustrations about having been exposed as a female writer, of having lost the last mark which divided her, of lifting the veil that once covered her gender and enabled her to write about sympathy from a gender-neutral perspective.

The next chapters will examine the ways in which the characters in Eliza's early novels, up until and including "The Lifted Veil," achieve sympathy and deal with suffering. I will examine those characters who, like Eliza herself, may be considered divided and fragmentary, as well as those who tend to be searching for a whole, unified self or object. Those who, unlike Eliza, are subjects of certainty. I will contend, then, that those who can be seen, like Eliza, as uncertain and unmodified subjects are more capable of achieving what for Eliza is one of the most highest values

of structural symmetry.

"THE TWO FACES OF THE REV. MISS MATTHEW"

The Doctrine of Sympathy

George Eliot addressed every episode in her career as a fiction writer. From her attitude toward the parties of the Established Church in England, to her general feeling about the country life she had left behind her, to her later views concerning the "Woman Question" and complex human relationships, the frequentest elements of her thought are evident, as they were in the scenes she used herself. Indeed, as difficult as it is to tie Eliot to one religious or philosophical creed as discussed in Chapter one, it seems equally impossible to point to one single theme which informs her fiction. Essentially, there is an idea that pervades her early fiction, which, I believe, allows us to view her characters in the same light as we have seen Eliot herself in the previous chapter. Sympathy, a quality which she recognized as lacking in novels which she reviewed for the Westminster in her early career and which she later saw as lacking in reviews of her own works which were being scrutinized due to their doubtful authorship, becomes the moral fibre of Eliot's characters in her own fiction.

Eliza Lewis reviewed many artists and their art during her career at the Westminster. Her opinions regarding art during this time enable us to see her "Doctrine of Sympathy"

evolving in those years just before she wrote Aspects of Victorian Life. She truly saw the artist's role as one that should enlarge the sympathies which exist between human beings. In her 1884 article on the German novelist, W.E. Hall, she speaks specifically of the importance of sympathy, yet her call in this passage is for a specific type of people, the more oppressed or "heavily-laden" people who were the subjects of so much nineteenth-century literature.

Art is the nearest thing to life: it is a mode of multiplying experience and extending our contact with our fellow-men beyond the bounds of our personal lot. All the more sacred is the task of the artist when he undertakes to paint the life of the People It is serious that our sympathy with the personal joys and struggles, the toil, the tragedy, and the honour in the life of our most heavily-laden fellow-men, should not be perverted, and turned toward a false object instead of the true one. (418-19)

In the same article, she makes the important point that the artist's responsibility is to instill in his or her reader a sympathetic response to the subject of his or her work, not a sympathetic response to the work or artist in and of themselves. The Victorian usage of the word "earn" in the following passage means "receive from," not "ought to pay to." Thus, the moral duty which arose for the artist in the

offering to his or her audience that sympathetic understanding which enables the recipients of the art to see a part of themselves in someone else.

The members of the audience receives from the artist the greatest gift. For Eliot, that is the ability to look outside of and beyond themselves and into the pain of another. By pointing out what an artist should be concerned with, she is also pointing out the lack of sympathy in Eliot's work,

The greatest benefit we owe to the artist, whether painter, poet, or novelist, is an extension of our sympathies. Appeals based on generalizations and statistics require a sympathy ready-made, a moral sentiment already in activity; but a picture of human life such as a great artist can give, surprises even the trivial and the selfish with that attraction that is apart from themselves, which may be called the real material of moral sentiment. [14 emphasis mine]

This sympathetic ability to direct one's feelings away from oneself and towards another, we shall see, is an important key to understanding the way sympathy works between characters in Eliot's fiction.

However, during the period, then, as a journalist, she was formulating her "doctrine" of sympathy, the doctrine was severely limited compared to the extension of sympathy even

in her fiction. She herself appears not to have been sympathetic to her nonsympathetic fellow authors. But in her fiction, she portrays both those who offer sympathetic responses and those who fail to offer sympathetic responses to others. Perhaps she perceived a paradox in this failure when she wrote as a reviewer. In any case, she chose to write as a sympathetic, conscientious narrator in her early pieces of fiction. She presents herself as a non-gestured narrator who is able and willing to sympathize not only with but for those who cannot feel sympathy themselves. Her function then as narrator is to fill in the gaps, to offer sympathy where sympathy does not yet exist. This narrator of the early fiction offers sympathy for those characters who are deprived of sympathy themselves by unsympathetic figures in the story and also offers sympathy for those who are incapable of offering it themselves or who are preoccupied with sympathy. As we shall see in the next section, the figure in Elsie's fiction who is seen as in need of the greatest sympathetic response is the person who is unable to offer that grand gesture him or herself, and she. In many instances, receives sympathy only from the narrator.

Though Marian Lewis never named the episode for her early fiction, it is evident in several of her correspondences that sympathy was the "idea" which she felt was important enough to convey to her readers. The

following passage from a letter to John Blackwood, about a second printing of *Source of Historical Life*, indicates that she had an important message to convey in the book, though that message is unspecified and unnamed.

I am very anxious that the "Source of Historical Life" should have every chance of impressing the public with its existence....because there are ideas in these stories about which I have a great deal, and am not sure I can ever embody again.

(Letters III 146)

Using the same perspective as in chapter one, which provided an examination of Eliot's life based on Leavis's ideas concerning the subject of certainty, the third and fourth sections of this chapter will examine the characters from "The Sad Fortunes of the Rev. John Barton" as they live out their lives in an uncertain and fragmentary way, a way which, I claim, best reveals one's sympathetic view of others, which is, for Eliot, one's moral development in one's relationship with others. We shall also see how those characters who tend to mask out whole, unified visions of themselves do not achieve this sympathetic vision because they fail to achieve this capacity for sympathy. Because they are unable to see a part or a fragment of someone else's suffering in themselves; seeing themselves as whole; all they see is an illusion of themselves.

Leavis's "Mirror Stage," described in a paper in 1934,

offers us an understanding of this sympathetic stimulus. A subject, in front of the mirror, expecting to see a whole self, sees only a part of himself in it and therefore sees himself as fragmented, the specular I. But for Lacan, the specular I, in order to grow, must become the social I, incorporated into a "dialectic that will henceforth link the I to socially structured situations" (1971b: 49). The specular I, having acquired the understanding that he himself is not a whole, unified being, can now understand his relationship to others in the same way and become the social I. Indeed, Lacan recognizes all human desire, the basis for human motivation in his theory, in the way that it relates to the desire of another person, something only the social I can be aware of. For Lacan all human reactions, including sympathetic reactions, are an outgrowth of that relationship. "The relativity of human desire in relation to the desire of the other is what we recognize in every reaction of rivalry, of competition, and even in the entire development of civilization, including the sympathetic and fundamental exploitation of man by man" (*Lacan's Papers on Technique* 149 emphasis mine). Lacan's theory then enables us to recognize the sympathetic qualities of a character who thrives on fragmentation as well as the less understanding, less sympathetic illusory nature of a character who thrives on unity. George Eliot, of course, had not read Lacan, or even Freud. Before examining the fiction itself, it is

important to have an understanding of what philosophies and literary movements were available to her and helped to shape her views regarding sympathy. We will also see that they do not account for the ways in which she intuitively anticipates love.

As early as 1819, Eliot expresses in her personal correspondence her ideas about how the sharing of both joys and sufferings is integral to human relationships and should be expressed in fiction. Responding in a letter to Charles Bray, in which she claims that his own self-proclaimed doctrine, "The Philosophy of Necessity," is in reality "the disregard of individuals as a lofty condition of mind" (Quinn 2:118), she sets forth her ideas concerning sympathy and suffering. "By our experience and development changes every day by conviction that our moral progress may be measured by the degree in which we sympathize with individual suffering and individual joy" (118 emphasis mine). Later in her career, we see not only her concern with the ideas associated with sympathy, but also her insistence that this quality is essential to the moral fibre of human beings. In a letter to Barbara Bodichon in 1841 she expresses the necessity of sympathy: that is, that nothing is worthwhile unless one has someone with whom to share that which is common to both.

It is hard to believe long together that anything is "worth while," unless there is some eye to

kindle is common with our own, some brief word uttered now and then to imply that what is infinitely precious to us is precious alike to another mind. I fancy that to do without that guarantee one must be either insane-- one must be a bad poet, or a sponsor of impossible theories, or an inventor of impossible machinery. However, it is not brief words either of time or distance that divides you from those who thoroughly share your cares and joys--always accepting that portion which is the hidden private life of every human being. (Pines 11 188)

Consistently, in Eliot's private correspondence, we see the key words "sympathy," "suffering," "sharing" and in correspondence as well as in her early fiction, we see the word "fellow-feeling," which she appeared to be fond of using. Indeed, Eliot's use of sympathy to show moral development in human relationships is so integral to her early fiction that it is important to note that the word itself is derived from the Greek *sympatheia*, meaning like feeling or fellow-feeling; the distinction between general good will or benevolence and humanity's capability of sharing grief and joy is made.

How did Eliot formulate this doctrine, which so informed her early fiction? We must consider the origins of what is known as her "doctrine of sympathy," those writers

and thinkers who influenced her thought. According to Thomas Hobbes (1948), she has produced the fullest discussion to date, Eliot's portrait of sympathy evokes elements of eighteenth-century moral sentiment, Evangelical humanitarianism, the Romantic imagination, and Victorian humanitarism (24).

Much of the foundation of Eliot's doctrine lies in the eighteenth-century reaction against the self-regarding ethics of Thomas Hobbes. Edward Burke and Anthony Shaftesbury, as well as Francis Hutcheson and James Hutcheson, in opposition to Hobbes, claimed that an innate feeling for the common good existed in humanity. They believed that sympathy was an instinctive moral sense. Hutcheson, in particular, stressed the importance of "fellow-feeling," a term often used in Eliot's early fiction, as the basis of moral action. Burke, writing in 1789, saw sympathy as imitation, but as Hobbes points out, he also saw sympathy as primarily a matter of will. Burke's theory did not involve the imagination, a factor which the Romantic would bring to it thirty to forty years later (27-28). Burke's key words are similar to those Eliot uses to describe her "Morizins" concerning sympathy. However, as we see in the following passage from Burke's *A Philosophical Inquiry*, the sharing of the other's feeling and the ability to see a part of one's self in the other person's suffering, both essential to Eliot's concept of sympathy, are not addressed.

In 1787 Burke defines *sympathy*:

It is by the first of these passions that we enter into the concerns of others; that we are moved as they are moved, and are never suffered to be indifferent spectators of almost anything which men can do or suffer . . . sympathy must be considered as a sort of substitution, by which we are put into the place of another man. (qtd. in Noble 80)

Adam Smith, in 1759, incorporated Romantic views of sympathy by proposing the supremacy of the imagination in its function. That the moral life is founded not in the will but in the imagination is a central thought in the poetry of two noted Romantic poets, William Wordsworth (who was Eliot's favorite poet) and Percy Shelley. The fundamental role of the imagination lies behind Shelley's statement that "the great instrument of moral good is the imagination," and Wordsworth's description in the *Preface* of "spiritual love" which

. . . . sets our own souls
Without imagination, which, in truth,
Is but another name for absolute power
and clearer insight, exaltation of mind,
And reason is her most exalted mood. (CPV, 140-
42).

Moreover, much of English Romantic thought on the

subject has to do with the way in which the sympathetic imagination of the artist enables him to achieve a direct experience with his object. The Romantic emphasis on sympathy then is an aesthetic one, rather than a moral or a psychological one. Wordsworth says in the Preface to the Lyrical Ballads, for example, that the sympathetic imagination enables the artist to "bring his feelings near to those of the persons whose feelings he describes, nay for short spaces of time, perhaps, to let himself slip into an entire delusion, and even confused and identify his own feelings with theirs" (104).

The Romantic emphasis upon the sympathetic imagination as a means of communicating the feelings of others so that readers can "identify" with them is as strong in George Eliot's conceptions of the artist as it is in Wordsworth's. However, Eliot's vision of sympathy does deal with the moral impulse which encourages sympathetic interaction between people more than any writer before her. In 1850 she says of her art, "the only effect I earnestly long to produce by my writings is that those who read them should be better able to imagine and to feel the pains and joys of those who differ from themselves in everything but the broad fact of being struggling living human creatures" (Letters III 111). The importance of enabling readers to feel for others is so supreme that she underscores the key words, "imagine" and "feel" which indicate the importance of sharing both sorrow

and happiness with others. A passage from the same letter indicates the important moral stance she sees for herself as an artist and the important role sympathy has as a tool in allowing her to express that moral stance in her fiction. "If art does not enlarge men's sympathies, it does nothing service" (*Letters* III 113).

While George Eliot's doctrine of sympathy appears to have been derived from the currents of charity and good will which began to circulate through the philosophers, thinkers, and poets of the eighteenth century, its formulation also has much to do with the circumstances peculiar to the nineteenth century. Mid-Victorian ideals of both sympathy and benevolence reflect a revolt against the new and ever changing ethos associated with the growing industrial age; problems concerning child labor, poor working and living conditions for the overworked, underpaid lower classes who were confronted with the onslaught of new machinery, riots of workers--all these became subject matter for Victorian novelists and poets. The need for sympathy in this respect, for example, is clear in John Stuart Mill's attack on Jeremy Bentham, who, while notoriously hostile to imaginative literature, also ignored the "love of loving, the need of sympathizing support, or of objects of admiration and reverence" (qtd. in *Wells* 41), though the portrayal of specific human suffering surrounding industrial workers did not occur in literature until the mid nineteenth century.

Mill's view concerning the lack of sympathy in the early part of the century was reflected in the novels of that time as well. John Gaskell's *Arthur Clennam* and F.D. Maurice's *Justice Cony* are both characters who either overlook "the sordid sympathies and convictions of mankind" (qtd. in *Wells* 48) or exemplify a hero who experiences a "Benthamite" period and is nearly destined to sacrifice the "gentle sympathies and kindly affections" to the "intellectual all-in-all" (qtd. in *Wells* 48). In all of these examples, we see that sympathy still does not have a moral value attached to it.

Feelings of benevolence and sympathy were further inspired in the nineteenth century when the degradation, both physical and moral, of industrial workers became overwhelmingly apparent. Writers such as Thomas Carlyle and Matthew Arnold addressed this social ill by appealing to the consciences of the well-off. Others such as Dickens, Elizabeth Gaskell, and Eliot attempted to arouse sympathy for the suffering humanity. Walter Rauschenb (1881) saw Dickens as one of the originators of Victorian humanitarianism: "The unfeeling abstinence of the early part of this century was to be corrected by an extreme--perhaps an excessive--sensibility to human suffering in the years which have followed" (qtd. in *Wells* 48). It is important to point out, however, that neither Dickens nor Eliot was a social reformer in any real sense. Eliot's

first and foremost commitment was to the artist's responsibility to stimulate reform and arouse in the reader "the nobler emotions, which were destined to win the social right" (*Letters* VII 44). In the same letter, Eliot articulated her preference for expanding society's sufferings rather than actively working to eliminate them. "It is one thing to feel keenly for one's fellow-beings; another to say, 'This wrong, and this alone, will be the lever to take for the removal of particular calamities.'" Nevertheless, Eliot's conception of sympathy is of a different kind from that of Dickens's, whose feeling for the misfortune of one character arouses in us a general feeling of sympathy for society as a whole; we do not see private sympathy working between individual human beings. Neither did he give us the perception of his characters doing good as feeling for another out of a moral obligation to that person. As Murphy says of Dickens' heroes, "not one of them has a . . . considered opinion about why he does good" (qtd. in *Wells* 44). Of the differences between Eliot's and Dickens's perceptions of sympathy, Thomas Wells states, "Dickens did not 'aim as high,' he did not have man 'be true fellow-feeling . . . which would inevitably promote the common good' as Eliot attempted to do (43). Instead, Dickens ' hoped mainly to stimulate private charity . . . the benevolence which he urged required simple sweetness rather than sympathy' (43). W.B. Douglass

Comments on the distinction between benevolence as true sympathy in Eliot and benevolence as self-centered sentimentality in Dickens.

Benevolence need not, however, degenerate into sentimentality. It does not do so, as very slightly in the work of George Eliot, the other major Victorian besides Dickens who made the promotion a central aim of fiction. The reason is that for Eliot the essential thing, the foundation of genuine benevolence, is not feeling as such but understanding. It originates in a clear and compassionate perception of human suffering, which then quickens the natural emotions of pity and love; with the result that the emotions are commensurate with what such an object would normally arouse and warrant, and not, as in sentimentalism, too intense for an object which is not duly perceived The sentimental indulgence of pity and love is easily self-centered--one enjoys feeling a burst of kindness for those less fortunate than himself--whereas George Eliot's benevolence presupposes a forgetfulness of self in the recognition of our common humanity. The distinction asserts a re-entrance on sympathy as the power of entering into the feelings of another. (276)

Finally, we can see that sympathy for George Eliot was a viable substitute for the conventional, traditional religious faith she had grown up with her nineteenth year, though in her new "doctrine of sympathy" she does retain part of the values of that very faith. She revised the Christian "doctrine" that she knew so well, removed the emphasis on a human-spiritual relationship to God and replaced it with a human-human relationship, which she thought much more important. Indeed, as she indicates to Francis H'kibert-Marade, she believes that any concern with the notion of a Christian afterlife, what she calls "our future existence," only overshadows what is to her the more important, immediate goal of strengthening human relationships here on earth.

On that question of our future existence . . . my most rooted conviction is, that the immediate object and the proper sphere of all our highest emotions are our mortal fellow-men and this earthly existence. (Letters III 261 emphasis mine)

And though she does convey her revised version of Christianity here, what she is even more aware of is her need to practice her new "doctrine of sympathy" and to extend it to those who still practice what was once her faith. This letter represents both her need to cling to part of that childhood faith she had renounced and to have, in her words, "sympathy" with it, not a total break from it.

because that faith did emphasize human understanding. Referring to the "wrong held Evangelical Christianity" once laid on her and the drastic break she had made from it, she conveyed to him the sympathy or sameness of feeling she now, in 1818, (240 years after her departure from [4]), has with the feeling of that belief.

I have no longer any antipathies towards any faith in which human sorrow and human longing for purity have expressed themselves; on the contrary, I have a sympathy with it that predominates over all argumentative tendencies. I have not returned to dogmatic Christianity--in the acceptance of any set of doctrines as a creed, and a superhuman revelation of the Divine-- but I see it in the highest expression of the religious sentiment that has found its place in the history of mankind, and I have the profoundest interest in the inward life of sincere Christians in all ages....on many points where I used to delight in expressing intellectual differences, I now delight in feeling an emotional agreement. [110 emphasis mine]

In her appropriation of her new "religion," she was sympathetically aware of the presence of the other which was left behind in the old. What she had left in the old faith was the belief that Heaven would help us. She now believed instead that her new religion of humanity would teach us all

the more to help one another. "Sympathy" then is a moral virtue for Eliot's religion because it is necessary for the public health of both parties, not because of some abstract principle of divine order.

George Eliot and The Divided Narrative

of "The Sad Fortunes of the Rev. Amos Barton"

In George Eliot's first piece of published fiction, "The Sad Fortunes of the Rev. Amos Barton," the narrative appears to be divided or undesignated in gender probably in part because Marian Evans had not yet become "George Eliot." The writer had not yet appropriated the pseudonym until after she had written the story and sent it to Blackwood for publication. There is evidence, however, that she wanted to present herself as masculine in this story, even without having chosen the masculine pseudonym. Only days before she began writing "The Sad Fortunes of the Rev. Amos Barton," she was finishing her long and witty review article "Filly Novels by Lady Newillote," in which she launches a scathing masculine attack at women writers. She had finished writing the "Filly Novels" article on September 18, 1834 and on September 23rd, had begun "Amos Barton." It is very likely then that the way she chose to express herself as narrator in her early fiction was influenced by the apparently male voice she had chosen to use as a journalist. The mode in such undertaking, however, were not the same. As I have pointed out earlier, the anonymity of the articles offered

her public the understanding that the articles were penned by a man and therefore she was able to express her strong opinions concerning literary women's failings, particularly their failure to adequately portray sympathetic understanding in their works. It must be made clear however that Marian Lewis was not claiming that women in general had no capacity for fellow-feeling or sympathy but was instead claiming that novels by women, like similar works by men, were neglecting the important thing of sympathy itself. She does express many opinions in "Billy Kevins" concerning women novelists' inability to portray a sympathetic understanding between human beings. In this particular excerpt, for example, she sees traditional Christianity as the greatest stumbling block to this great end.

In a general rule, the ability of a lady novelist to describe actual life and her failings, is in inverse proportion to her confident eloquence about God and the other world, and the means by which she actually chooses to conduct you to true ideas of the invisible is a totally false picture of the visible. (Penny 51)

As she changes her position as literary reviewer to literary artist, she appears to be attempting to rectify the problem she saw by creating literature which expresses human sympathies instead of antipathies and criticizing literature which does not.

Kitch's great strategy in the early fiction then is that one should have sympathy for those who are imaginative. Examination of sympathy. And the relevance of the narrator in the fiction, as will be discussed, has much to do with the public's understanding that "he" was a clergyman, a clergyman who was able to feel sympathy for the unsympathetic Reverend Amos Barton. That the narrator was a clergyman appeared to be an understanding which Kitch, early on, wished to promote. In her Journal entry entitled "How I Came to Write Fiction," she enthusiastically writes of how the Blackwood publishers did not suspect her gender and instead conjectured that the writer of "Amos Barton" was a clergyman.

There was clearly no suspicion that I was a woman.

It is interesting, as an indication of the value there is in such conjectural articles generally, to remember that when G. read the first part of "Racco" to a party at Kelp's, they were all sure I was a clergyman--a handsome one. [Letters II (44)]

Indeed, the first indication that the ruse was established came to Lewis in a letter from Blackwood who effusively welcomed: "I am glad to hear that your friend is as I supposed a Clergyman. Such a subject is both in clerical hands and more of the pleasantest and least prejudiced correspondents I have ever had are English Clergymen" [Letters II 271]. But there are other characters in the

story, all who are not in a clerical position, and many, who, like Anne, are incapable of sympathetic understanding. We shall see then that Eliot's sympathies as narrator are far-reaching and all-encompassing. The uncertainty of the narrator's gender in the early fiction, I believe, has much to do with this scope Eliot wishes her sympathy to have. One must not necessarily be a male to understand the suffering of another male, nor a female to understand the suffering of another female. However, there are instances in her fiction when shared background experiences do help in the sympathetic interchange between human beings. Such is the case in "Anne Barton" when we see the narrator's familiarity with the clerical sphere as an excuse to his extension of sympathy to Anne.

Perhaps because she had doubts concerning the acceptance of her fiction as account of her gender, because she was not yet the public male persona "George Eliot," she occasionally yet only occasionally attempted to present the narrator, her persona, as specifically masculine. The narrator is fragmented or inconsistent not only in gender, but in personality and attitudes. As we shall see, the narrator of "Anne Barton" often comes across as a wise, understanding, nostalgic and sympathetic Victorian. Other times, the narrator is questioning and somewhat judgmental, particularly to those characters who do not have sympathy for others. These weaknesses are, however, byproducts of

The narrator's main function in the fiction, his or her role in "Helen Barton," I believe, is to have sympathy for those who do not have the ability themselves to have that great quality. Part of that role is to point out that particular flaw, i.e., the lack of sympathy, in human beings. F.C. Steppinacher sees Eliot's unique narrative technique as her need to have both truth in art as well as historical truth. "She had herself encouraged it [this truth] by resorting to the fiction of an untrained provincial observer who had personally known Helen Barton" (iii). As narrator, Eliot is not a subject of certainty because she presents herself as not certainly feminine and only half-heartedly presents herself as certainly masculine, due to the questions raised by her ambiguous position early on as historian. Moreover, the uncertainty of her masculinity may also be considered a frequent, perhaps, of the masculine persona she used when she was an anonymous writer for the Westminster and the Leader. This uncertainty is not clearly productive, but it may contribute to the openness of the other in sympathy which Eliot wishes to promote.

Our first glimpse of the narrative persona offers us a picture of a knowledgeable, older, observant man, (though the "maleness" of this narrator is not specifically clear, as will be discussed) telling us much about the physical state of Stapperton Church "five-and-twenty years ago."

Being a simile which refers to masculine physical characteristics and may suggest the narrator's gender, he claims that the walls of the church were as smooth as "the Rev. Anna Burton's head, after ten years of baldness and supererogatory soap" (41; ch.1). We must read through several cryptic references to the first-person narration, that is, the use of the subject "I," as well as the possessive "my" and "mine," until we can even attempt to discern the narrator's position, as either male or female, in the Shapperton community. It is clear that the narrator is older and quite nostalgic as "he" laments the changes that have taken place in the church in the past quarter century and almost longs for the imaginative return of the older architectural style which is being sacrificed for the premises of the new. "Imagination does a little Turlin by the sky, revealing in regret that dear, old, brown, crumbing picturesque inefficiency in everywhere giving place to spick-and-span new-painted, new-varnished efficiency" (41; ch.1). We also see the narrator as both one who has a sentimental penchant for all things past and who is at the same time aware of this sentimentality. "Mine, I fear, is not a well-regulated mind. It has an occasional tenderness for old shams; it lingers with a certain fondness over the days of moss, clerks and top-hatted persons" and as a self-consciously observant recorder of the architectural structure of Shapperton church. The

narrator writes:

It is not surprising that I recall with a fond
affection Shaperton Church as it was in the old
days, with its outer wall of rough stone, its
red-tiled roof, its heterogeneous windows patched
with auxiliary bits of painted glass, and its
little flight of steps with their wooden rail
running up the outer wall, and leading to the
school-children's gallery. (481 ch.1)

And as the narrative moves on, he shares more than his
observations of the physical structure of the church. He
also shares his experiences as a young member of the
congregation, expressing his childhood feeling of both
physical discomfort: "Even when I was as much a member of
the congregation, . . . my nerves found it necessary to
provide break-and-butter into the sacred edifice" (481
ch.1), and his unintentional awareness of his sacred
surroundings after short lapses of concentration during the
service:

No benches in those days; but long rosy pews,
rowed which devout church-goers sat during
"lessons," trying to look anywhere else than into
each other's eyes. No low partitions allowing
you, with a dreamy absence of interest and
mystery, to see everything at all moments; but
half dark pews, under whose shadow I went with a

years of retirement through the library, only to feel with more intensity my thrust into the consciousness of public life when I was asked to stand up at the altar during the praise at the singing. (412-413).

These two particular references to the narrator's childhood role in Shepperton Church make the certainty of the wife's gender even more difficult to discern, if we consider that both young boys and young girls may have a short attention span during church services and that both may pay less attention to the details of the church itself, particularly during the service. Nevertheless, both of these passages reflect the memories of the narrative persona who is now, twenty five years later, an adult, and it is to these references that we must look to explore the femininity or masculinity of this persona.

Having established "himself" as both an observer and a participant of the Shepperton Church and its worship services, the narrator next reveals himself as just that: the story teller; that is, the story teller who is nearly "tempted" to tell the story of one of the more recent clergymen, that of Mr. Milfil. By revealing that he knows both Mr. Milfil and Anne, he reveals his familiarity with the church and its clergy. "As for the clergyman, Mr. Milfil, an excellent old gentleman, who smoked very long pipes, and preached very short sermons, I must not speak of

him, or I might be tempted to tell the story of his life . . . at present I am concerned with quite another sort of clergyman--the Rev. John Barton" (42; ch.1). That the narrator is inclined to tell us the story of a clergyman, and even "tempted" to tell us *his* different clergymen's stories, suggests that he or she has had as intimate access to the clerical system. This in itself may suggest the reliability of the narrator.

Dickens and the other Victorians who first read Eliot found the uncertainty of the author's gender unsettling. Indeed, the only key to discerning the mystery of the identity of "George Eliot" was that which could be detected within the narrative voice. Of the question of the gender of the narrator in Eliot's early fiction, Susan Beer claims that "she saw the impossibility of writing within a single discourse" (43); that is, it was undesirable and too limiting for her to present herself as *either* male *or* female. As we have seen, even her early journalistic writings reveal this difficulty. And as Beer points out, these "problems of equivocal discourses" (44) will be seen in the fiction of George Eliot as well as the articles of Marian Evans. In evaluating the gender of the narrator in Eliot's early fiction, it is not my intention to claim that she was trying to make a feminist or masculinist statement. My intention instead is to show that Eliot was attempting to show that she sympathetically understood the plight of the

common, ordinary clergymen and those common, ordinary human beings that associated with him. The identity of the experience is one of sympathy because there are hints that the narrator's status is a clerical one. This status is not that of just another congregationalist cleric who rules, hence the narrative must be told, but I claim that Eliot takes on a clerical narrative persona in order to do this.

Conversely, the "realism" of the narrator of "Anne Barton" had much to do with the fact that "he" was understood to be a clergyman by Blackwood and many Britains who read the novella. George and Marian Lewis prayed the author to be understood that way for the sake of Marian's sympathy. As mentioned in chapter one, Lewis presented Marian's manuscript to Blackwood as having come from "a clerical friend" (Letters II 218). And perhaps as a byproduct of this desire, the realism of Eliot's narrative structure helped to realistically convey the clerical nature of a narrator who understands the sufferings and the joys of his subjects. As we shall see, though the public was not necessarily convinced that the author was a clergyman, it did recognize the narrator's familiarity with and understanding of the needs and problems incident to the clerical position. It appears that that while Marian Lewis wanted her authorship to be understood as otherness—that of a clergyman—she also afforded understanding of the very position she presents as narrator, a sympathetic

understanding of the clergy.

Lacan offers us a way to interpret and perhaps understand Merleau-Lapin's disingenuous approach to presenting himself in her narrative as someone other than her unmarried self, as someone with a questionable gender, and even in her signature as someone other than a woman with a fixed, feminine name. In his essay "Looking Awry," Slavoj Žižek analyzes the way in which we gaze at objects, claiming that the beyond, the ungraspable, the thing as object of desire which Lacan says we attempt to "get at" in the "Mirror Stage," is really a way of looking at things, or in this case, at one's self, in what is a "distorted" yet healthier way than looking at the self straight on.

If we look at a thing straight on, from a neither-of-fact perspective, we see it 'as it really is,' while the look prompted by our desires and aversions ('looking awry') gives us a distorted, skewed image of the thing The object assumes clear and distinctive features only if we look at it 'from aside,' i.e., with an 'interested' look, with a look supported, perturbed, and disturbed by a desire. This is precisely the Lacanian objet petit a the objet petit a is always, by definition, perceived in a distorted way, because, outside this distortion, 'in itself,' it does not exist. (24)

This Lacanian perspective is valuable in understanding Marion Leves's desire to keep her friends and readers from knowing her true identity. In her appropriating a male name and a male occupation, she deliberately distances even her friends by reporting rumors that others were reading the author of the Journal and even John Burt. We see her very indirect way of approaching her subjectivity. We see her at the side of the mirror, not facing it straight on, thriving on the fragmentation which the cold glass allows her to recognize in herself, i.e., the clerical, perhaps more masculine or sexually ambiguous part of her, and most importantly the part of her which is reflected back as the otherness of human beings, not as a self within itself.

By presenting herself as not herself, as not a woman, or not even a self-sufficient woman living happily with a son, but instead as a cleric with the understanding of unworldly attached to it, she is putting herself in the place of the other. And this part of her which is outside of her and beyond her would never be recognized were she to face her subjectivity head on. Moreover, in this is not her gender, so what is represented in Journal of Clerical Life is not her religious both these categories are outside of her. In a Lacanian way, Ellet is never a self within herself. Both she and Leves allowed her narrative persona to be understood to be that of a clericism. This choice gave her the opportunity both to mask her gender and identity as

author, which, as we shall see, she wanted to do, and to present her own sympathetic understanding of the ordinary, struggling lives of clergymen.

While Lewis made sure that the clerical status of the author was accepted by the publishers, Marian too kept up the pretence, particularly with her country friends. Even after the truth of her authorship and the gender of the enigmatic "George Eliot" had been divulged to Blackwood, she recorded part of a letter she had received from Jane Barnard in her own letter to him, telling him he would be "amused" by Jane's conviction that all of the Scenes of Clerical Life as well as Adam Bede were written by a man, Joseph Liggins. Marian herself appeared to be quite happy that the ruse was working. "The other day I received a letter from an old friend in Warwickshire containing some striking information about the author of 'Adam Bede.' I extracted the passage [in your manuscript]" (Letters III 84 emphasis mine). And she chose to share with Blackwood the portion of the letter which reveals Jane's presumption that Liggins had at least an association with the clergy. This is an excerpt from Jane's letter to Marian, which was sent to Blackwood in April, 1858.

"I want to ask you if you have read 'Adam Bede' or the 'Scenes of Clerical Life', and whether you know the author is Mr. Liggins.....a deputation of dissenting persons went over to ask him to write

for the Electing, and they found him washing his
 soap-basin at a pump....You know he calls himself
 "George Eliot". It sounds doubtful [sic] whether
 he is a woman, what here he is so well known.'
 (qtd. in Letters III 84)

And Marian evidences in the letter to Blackwood, referring
 to "George Eliot," almost as here does, as if this really
 were to her another person. The tone of her comments seems
 to be an expression of hope that the editors will enjoy the
 pretense as much as she does. "Consider the fact George
Eliot's feelings, conscious of being a less working--not
 washing his own soap-basin, and not giving away his M.A.! I
 hope you and Major Blackwood will enjoy the myth" (Letters
III 44 emphasis mine). Indeed, John Blackwood appeared to
 be most aware of and most sensitive to Marian Lewis' desire
 to be perceived as someone other than herself. From 1837-
 1858, several of his letters to her were still signed with
 the salutation "My Dear Sir," many of these letters having
 been written after Blackwood's knowledge of George Eliot's
 true gender. Indeed, Marian appeared to be enjoying the
 pretense, letting others simply understand or assume that
 the editor was a cleric and then sharing the rumors of the
 pretense with her publisher.

In her response to Farn's letter, she disingenuously
 alludes to the fact that she herself seems to recall a Mr.
 Lewis from the days of her youth in Weymouth and

admits that she recalls his clerical attire. Her response also seems to suggest that she sees no advantage in acknowledging herself as the author of the Journal of Miss Leigh and would prefer that the author be understood to be a clergyman. She tells Mary that she will indulge herself in reading the work and that she recalls a "Mr. Higgins as a vision of my childhood--a tall black coated spectral young clergyman-in-specter" (Letters III 48 emphasis mine).

Even when she was writing to those who knew that Higgins was a fraud, Maria appeared to prefer to promote the understanding that the author of the Journal was a clergyman. Indeed, Maria seems to have begun early to take efforts to direct the aim upon authorship away from herself. In a letter to her half-sister Fanny in 1857, for example, she placed the emphasis upon the clerical status of the person she "understood" to be the "real" author of "Helen Norton," the enigmatic "George Eliot" whom some who are living around London. The letter shows how determined she was to convince her readers from her Warwickshire home that the author, though not Higgins, was still indeed a clergyman. Perhaps because she knew Fanny was too well associated with the people in order to actually believe the Joseph Higgins story, she reports instead with some disingenuousness that a "Mr. Eliot," whom she "understands" to be a clergyman, is the author. Though denying the authenticity of Higgins, she still promotes the understanding that "Mr. Eliot" is a

clergyman. She also promotes her otherness by referring to herself and leave as curious yet uninformed fellow readers of the work which she deliberately misnames the "Classical Sketches."

You are wrong about Mr. Higgins or rather your informants are wrong. We too have been struck with the 'Classical Sketches', and I have recognized some figures and traditions connected with the old neighbourhood. But Elizabeth informs Mr. leave that the author is a Mr. Eliot, a clergyman. I presume Elizabeth is not misleading you!

The clerical nature of the narrative in Scenes of Classical Life not only prompted the bogus Joseph Higgins authorship, which Eliot appeared both to enjoy and dread, but also inspired a gawping clergyman to respond to the story of Anne Barton as one she was curiously amazed that the author had been writing his particular story. So perceptive was Eliot's portrayal and understanding of the lives of clergymen, of people other than herself, that those others indeed recognized themselves in her art. This letter, from the Reverend John Bywater of Yorkshire, arrived at the office of Mather's on June 15, 1850 and reveals that her art did convince her readers almost to the subject matter and setting of the Scenes that "one of these men," a clergyman, had written about their lives.

I have been a subscriber to your Magazine for about 22 years, and was much pleased when I read the last number of 'Ann Burton'--on showing it to my eldest daughter she said 'who in the world could have written this--have you papa?' as miraculously was as certain it was an episode in my own life....The two succeeding stories of Mr. Hilfi and Jonathan's Experiences, are historical reminiscences of the former time--where I was Quaker and of a clergyman and the persecutions to which he was subject, all in the immediate neighborhood where I resided, during the events recorded in the story of Ann Burton. (Letter 121 of emphasis mine)

Though Mr. Bayly does not take credit for authorship (he refers to Mr. Lippin and a Mr. King who do), the emphasis of this letter is upon the portrayal of a fictional clergyman's experiences, a portrayal so realistic that an actual clergyman believed the story of Ann Burton was a chronicle of his own experiences in that occupation. In 1850 another clergyman had written in response to Marian Evans's portrayal of clerical life, applauding the author for not yielding to the "vulgar" to achieve "effect". The Reverend Arthur Garway writes:

Sir--Will you consider it questionable in a brother author and old reviewer to address a few lines of

sincerest sympathy and admiration to you, excited by the purity of your style, originality of your thoughts, and absence of all vulgar seeking of effect in those "scenes of clerical life" now appearing in Blackcroft. (*House Life* I 114)

The Reverend Curney refers to his own clerical position, "I am one of the cloth" (105) but like the Reverend Dyer, does not allude to the author's saying as clerical, only to the author's understanding of that status. In "pleasant" was this letter from the Reverend Curney, Maria recorded the incident in her journal. The excerpt reveals the connection Eliot saw between the realism of the clerical life she portrayed and evidently conceived and the success of the story.

One of the pleasant little incidents of Jersey was a letter from Arthur Curney to the unknown author of 'Mr. Smith's Love Story', expressing deeply but warmly his admiration of the truth and originality he found in the clerical scenes. Near 6. came upstairs to me with the letter in his hands, his face bright with gladness, saying, 'Her taste's beginning already!' ('How I came to write Fictions' 411).

Eliot's realism was perceived yet another way. In a heavily ironic letter to the man she understood to be the author of the Epigrams, Mrs. Thomas Carlyle noted, after having read

them; "The newspaper critics have decided you are a clergyman, but I don't believe in the least in the world. You understand the use and the duties of a clergyman too well, for being one!" (Letters III 18). Her perceptive reading of the Times reveals that she knew all too well that a real clergyman would not portray so realistically and honestly the problems of his own occupation. Nevertheless, Barker had succeeded at one thing: most of her readers, whether they believed her novel's was written by a clergyman or not, recognized the narrator's sympathetic understanding and honest portrayal of the clerical position.

"The Red Fortunes of the Rev. Anne Barton" does have several allusions to the specific salience of the narrator and his understanding of the clerical role. However, these allusions have the function of creating a bond between the narrator and the man whose story he is telling. For instance in chapter one of "Anne Barton," the narrator, who has already presented himself as a knowledgeable member of Stoughton Church, also reveals his "salience" by listing that he has a kind of bond with Anne because he understands the difficult financial situation of a clergyman. The narrator makes it clear to his readers that he lived, like Anne, during those days when a man, as hard as he worked, could not make enough money to adequately support his family.

You are not imagining, I hope, that Anne Barton

was the household of Shaggyton. He was no such thing. These were days when a man could hold a curate's place on two of them, and live badly himself on the third. It was so with the vicar of Shaggyton. (141: ch.1)

Here the narrator expresses his knowledge of the clerical hierarchy, indicating the difference between an incumbent, the clergyman responsible for a parish and who holds the tithes that go with it, a curate, who is an incumbent's assistant, and a vicar who receives only a salary. The witness then of the narrator, whether understood to be a clergyman or not, appears to have much to do with his ability to feel sympathy for the clergyman Isaac Barton, who most tragically does not possess himself that ability to feel sympathy for another.

This will be the crucial rule of all of the narrations of Eliot's early fiction: that is, to offer a sympathetic understanding to those who themselves do not have sympathy. Having made clear the goal for sympathetic understanding of Anne, the narrator then extends his sympathetic understanding of this clergyman's financial difficulties, emphasizing the impossible task of making such a small salary meet his family's needs.

It was so with the vicar of Shaggyton . . . who exercised his vicarious functions towards Shaggyton by pocketing the sum of thirty-five pounds per

sums : . . . after the disbursement of eightpence of the annual stipend of his curate . . . gives a man with a wife and six children . . . by what process of division can the sum of eightpence per annum be made to yield a quotient which will cover that man's weekly expenditure. (44; ch.I)

To Maria Lewis, even more important than the question of authorship was the reality of the subject matter of the *Sketch*. And presenting the stark reality of this poor country clergyman, his family, and community, she found it necessary as narrator to know quite meticulously in time from time to time, to upbraid her female readers. In a letter to Blackwood concerning his " clerical friend's " manuscript, George Lewis, on Maria's behalf, presents her objective for the series: that is, to present the readers, uncoloured, and most revealing pictures of the English clergy.

This is what I am commissioned to say to you about the proposed series. It will consist of tales and sketches illustrative of the social life of our country clergy about a quarter of a century ago; but solely in its human and not at all in its theological aspects: the object being to do what has never yet been done in our literature, for we have had abundant religious stories polemical and doctrinal, but since the "Hear" and Miss Norton, no stories representing the clergy like any other

close with the humor, sadness, and troubles of other men. He begged us particularly to add that--as the speeches sent will sufficiently prove--the tone throughout will be sympathetic and not at all antagonistic. (Letters II 18K)

And this is a picture she absolutely refuses to glossrise. In quite a Hawthorne-like way, Herman Melville's purpose in writing of the clerical life was to present the ordinary.

In one of many notes to the reader, the narrator eloquently comments on the reason "he" is emphasizing the unexceptional: thanks to "frequent shocking incidents for your amusement," he asserts that:

My only wish must lie in the truth with which I represent to you the humble experience of ordinary fellow-mortals. I wish to stir your sympathy with commonplace troubles--to win our tears for real sorrow worse than we may live each day to you--such as waits neither in rage nor in regret, but in very ordinary desert apparel. (SR: ch.1)

Quite often, the narrator reminds us and makes a special point to remind his female readers that we are reading of the lives of only those very ordinary, and perhaps unexceptional people. We see this's ingenueness with women readers in this passage which practically chides a "lady reader" for expecting a more glamorous hero than Anne Barton.

The Rev. Isaac Barton, whose sad fortune I have undertaken to relate, was, you perceive, in no respect an ideal or exceptional character; and perhaps I am doing a bold thing to bespeak your sympathy on behalf of a man who was as very far from remarkable,—a man whose virtues were not heroic, and who had no undetected crimes within his bosom; who had not the slightest mystery hanging about him, but was grossly and unmitigably commonplace.... "An utterly uninteresting character!" I think I hear a jaded reader exclaim.... In whom tragedy seems certain to flounder, and comedy, and wonder, and mystery, the adventures of some personage who is quite a 'character'. (18; all's emphasis mine).

The passage has a twofold purpose: It represents both a frequent of Barton's earlier journalistic purposes by using a narrative voice to deliver—this time—what would appear to be "filly" female judgments, but without, and also corrects the narrator's intention to present the mistake, yet more realistic side of life.

According to Gillis later the narrator's "deliberately countervailing appropriations of male manners.... In the two books written while her pseudonym still held its sway,.... serve to reinforce the 'masculine' prevalence of the writing and playfully dramatize that presence" (18). The

character's reproach continues at length and is aimed directly at a female who not appreciating the ordinariness of Jane and for dismissing his story because of it. The tone of this address is derogatory yet its message is clearly meant to be instructive.

But, my dear ladies, it is no very large a majority of your fellow-countrymen that are of this insignificant stamp. At least eighty out of a hundred of your adult male fellow-Britons returned in the last census are neither extraordinarily silly, nor extraordinarily wicked, nor extraordinarily wise They are simply men of complexion more or less sallow, whose conversation is more or less dull and disjointed, yet these commonplace people--many of them--have a conscience, and have felt the sublime prompting to do the painful right; they have their unguessed sorrows, and their married joys; their hearts have gone out towards their first-born, and they have mourned over the irretrievable dead. (HC-4; ch.8)

Because Eliot so strongly associates her "doctrine of sympathy" in her narrative, her plea for sympathy reaches the point of proselytizing:

Why, is there not a pattern in their very insignificance--in our coexistence of their diminished narrow existence with the glorious

possibilities of that human voice which we share? Depend upon it, you would gain immensely if you would learn with us to see some of the poetry and the pathos, the tragedy and the comedy, lying in the experience of a human soul that looks out through dull grey eyes, and that speaks in a voice of quite ordinary tones. In that case, I should have no fear of your not caring to know what further befell the Mrs. Anne Burton. (JTB: 48-9)

Still, the business of the narrator is uncertain, especially if we consider that even women can take a chastising or denunciatory tone with other women. There are, nevertheless, two narrative sentences which undoubtedly reveal the existence of the narrator. Both of these examples are short asides to the reader, but they do unequivocally reveal a masculine personage. The first occurs in chapter two, after a long, detailed description of Milly's femininity: ". . . a large, fair, portly woman, with thick, close, chestnut curls which her well-rounded cheeks," the narrator speaks of Milly as a woman whom he might like for his own wife.

You would not, perhaps, have anticipated that this line would fall to the share of precisely such a man as Anne Burton, whom you have already received not to have the refined contribution for which you might have imagined Mrs. Burton's position to

be destined by preestablished harmony. (241.1,
 for now, do not wonder Anna Barton has great will.
 (241 ch.2 emphatic note)

In the Countess Tiarlocki's home in chapter three, the
 narrator notes that after dinner, while Anne and Mr.
 Bridgman have sat down to enjoy a game of chess, Milly and
 the Countess have sat down to talk. The narrator politely
 takes his leave and tells us so because the two are most
 likely discussing "woman's matters."

There is a silent game; and the Countess's chat
 with Milly is in quite an unfortunate--probably
 relating to woman's matters that it would be
 impertinent for us to listen to. (241 ch.2)

Clearly here, the narrator is a man extremely conscious of
 the gender of the people of whom he is speaking.

As mentioned earlier, the narrator does have his
 judgmental weaknesses, weaknesses which are nearly
 appendages of his function in this piece of fiction, a
 function which requires him to recognize both sympathetic
 and unsympathetic characters. The narrator's great
 conviction is to foster a sense of sympathetic feeling
 within the community for Anne Barton, a man, who, in turn,
 does not appear to have sympathy for, or a basic
 understanding of, his own congregation. Furthermore, the
 narrator does not list Anne's faults outright but shows them
 to us by way of a querulous, critical, impatient lot of

parishioners.

Lives and of Being Whole

The first perception of the Reverend Isaac Burton is offered to us through the dialogue of those who know him first-hand, the members of Shagerton Church. The nature of the complaints have a general tone of dissatisfaction regarding his techniques in the pulpit, his way of interacting with parishioners, and the general way in which he runs the church. And when he recognizes the sympathetic reactions they have to Anne's performance as clergyman, the narrative sympathetically points out the difficulties of his job. The people of Shagerton are quite clearly dissatisfied with Anne's tenure, I think, he does not represent for them the whole, unified, total image of what a clergyman should be. Many of these complaints are accompanied by a tone of general nostalgia for the way the church used to be run and regret that the previous clergyman is no longer with them. For example, Mr. Pilgrim and Mr. Mackit recall "the row in Shagerton Church last Sunday" concerning the singing of a wedding song for a new-married couple, which, according to Mr. Mackit, is "as pretty a psalm as' as pretty a tune as any in the prayer-book. It's been sung for every new-married couple since I was a boy . . . But Mr. Burton is old for the space, and a sort o' wonder as I can't join in it still" (47: ch.1). and Mr Pilgrim adds,

"he called out 'silenced' . . . when he got into the pulpit; and gave a kick out himself to some sitting-beams tune" (87; ch.2).

Furthermore, such grievances concerning Amos's duties as a clergyman bring about a derogatory comment upon his character or even his physical and social demeanor, further representing the desires they have for a complete and total illusion of both a perfect spiritual leader as well as a perfect human being. Mr. Pilgrim complains, "Neither a law-bred fellow, I think, Barton" (87; ch.1), Miss Julia Farguber "had observed that she percy heard any one smile as frightfully as Mr. Barton did--she had a great mind to offer him her pocket-handkerchief" (91; ch.2), and both of the Klans Farguber were surprised that a "man who had gone through the Russian system of a university education once addressed them in a letter as Dear Neds., apparently an abbreviation for Nedams" (94; ch.2).

Here then one parishioner notes that his approach to spiritual matters, both in a textual and a personal way, leaves much to be desired. Mr. Hooker's parable for the older, more traditional style of preaching, for example, prompts him to make this complaint about Amos: "that preaching without Hook's no good, only when a kid hit a girl, and has the Bible at his finger's end when he tries to preach w/out Hook, he ramble about, and don't touch his text" (97-98; ch.1). And Mrs. Patten is

equally unhappy with Anne's emphasis upon Christian sin. "When Mr. Parker comes to see us, he talks about nothing but my sins and my need o' mercy. Now, Mr. Hookitt, I've never been a sinner" (40v ch.1). These complaints laid out by the parishioners also reveal the expectations they have for Anne: that is, what they are complaining about is what they expect Anne to give them, perhaps because they have been used to receiving something else from a clergyperson. Implying that she preferred him to Anne, Mrs. Parker reminisces over Mr. Chiffell, Anne's predecessor. "What? 'ol Mr. Chiffell say, if he was worthy to know the changes we have come about i' the church these last ten years?" (40v ch.1). The members of the community then, with all of their complaints concerning Anne and his ministry, appear to be requiring him to be something or someone he is not. And just as the narrator chastises his lady readers for not accepting Anne as a suitable hero because he is not a white, married glorified hero, he also indirectly chastises the people of Shropshire for not accepting Anne as he is, and sympathetically places himself in Anne's spot, something which they have not done. The warning is that anything that is detrimental to one human being is really the detriment of all.

Indeed, what mortal is there of us, who would find his satisfaction enhanced by an opportunity of comparing the picture he presents to himself of his own doings, with the picture they make on the

mental return of his neighbors? The very capacity for good would go out of us no miracle can be wrought without faith--without the worker's faith in himself as well as the neighbor's faith in him. And the greater part of the worker's faith in himself is made up of the faith that others believe in him. (W's 46-8 [emphasis mine])

Here we see how important it is in Eliot's scheme that the parts of other human lives intermingle to create productive, content human beings, in and of themselves.

And while the various members of the community lay out their specific complaints about Isaac, the narrator continuously offers his sympathetic understanding of Isaac's behavior, pointing out in this passage that the general illusion Isaac has of himself is exactly what protects him from the judgments of his fellow men and women. While this illusion can at some times cause Isaac to stumble and see himself in a whole, illusory way, as will be shown, Eliot's inquiry of a mirror and the totalizing reflection cast back at those who perceive just one whole subject in it may have a similarity to Lacan's theory of the *mirror*, Eliot's self-perception in the mirror. Eliot's mirror similarly reveals how detrimental the knowledge of the total perception we are seeing as others see us. While Eliot's mirror is an instrument which reveals the whole, unified, unsympathetic

reflection of otherness, that is, that he who is being perceived looks for the wall and he is being perceived and and he is being perceived, Lacan's mirror is the "Mirror Stage" reflects back a similarly unified image of an infant which is the foundation for future healthy and unhealthy relationships with others. The infant is first a rival with himself when he finds out that the ideal unity he sees in the mirror cannot be touched, that he is fragmentary and not at all unified, and because of this fracture between early illusory wholeness and actual fragmentariness, either a healthy rivalry or an unhealthy aggressivity with other human beings may never be abolished. Eliot is grateful then for illusion for it allows us, in a Lacanian way, a much more pleasing and fragmented way of seeing ourselves than others see us as whole.

Thank Heaven, then, that a little illusion is left in us, to enable us to be useful and agreeable--that we don't know exactly what our friends think of us--that the world is not made of looking glass in which we look the figure we are making, and just what is going on behind our backs! By the help of friendly illusion, we are able to dream that we are charming--and our faces wear a becoming air of self-possession; we are able to dream that others may admire our talents--and our headship is undisturbed; we are able to

dream that we are doing much good--and we do a little. Thus it was with Anne Barton. (36: ch.2 emphasis added).

What in London, however, is that while Eliot points out the unsympathetic response the community has towards Anne, Anne himself, perhaps due to the protective illusion he places over himself, is equally unsympathetic to the members of the Shaperton community, particularly to those who are weaker in spiritual knowledge and understanding or weaker in self control. And Eliot suggests that this weakness is due to an attempt on Anne's part to find a definite, fixed answer to the problems of his congregation. Indeed, the setting of the "chapel," the large, stone, square workhouse, "A dark ugly district this; depressing enough to look at even on the brightest days" (36: ch.2), is appropriate, for this is the place where Anne tries to reach those most lost in his parish. And while Anne's intentions are genuinely good, Eliot does suggest that they are counterproductive as he tries desperately to reach these very unresponsive, uneducated, rustic people with absolutely the wrong and most unsoundest approach. Even his choice of scripture, as suitable to these provincial people, falls short of their understanding and any practical application it might have to their spiritual lives.

The first lesson was the twelfth chapter of Exodus, and Mr. Barton's exposition turned on

undivided heart. Nothing in the world more suited to the single understanding than instruction through familiar types and symbols; but there is always this danger attending it, that the interest of comprehension of your hearers may stop short precisely at the point where your spiritual interpretation begins. And Mr. Barton this morning succeeded in carrying the popular imagination to the dough-tub, but unfortunately was not able to carry it onwards from the well-known object to the unknown truths which it was intended to shadow forth. (43: ch.2)

The narrative also points out that Rev. does not only have an illusory opinion regarding his ability to reach his parishioners, but suggests that because of those very illusions he is unable to feel sympathy for and create sympathetic responses among the members of his parish. Moreover, the narrative also suggests that the illusions he has about the greatness of his clerical abilities are tied up with his own egotistical and superior view of himself.

Now, the Rev. Rev. Rev. Barton was one of those men who have a decided will and opinion of their own; he distrust . . . And as a very little unexcited rambling and unexcited discussion with him was that an Episcopalian Establishment was much more than unobjectionable, and on many other points he began

is that that he held opinions a little too far-
sighted and profound to be readily and readily
communicated to ordinary minds. [XV: ch.1]

But Eliot's narrative never suggests that Lane's intentions
themselves are bad; indeed, this is what makes Lane worthy
of sympathy. The character who misanthropically stereotypes notes:
"I think you will admit that the university-taught
clergyman, whose office is to bring home the gospel to a
handful of such souls, has a sufficiently hard task" (XV:
ch.3).

Nevertheless, Lane fails miserably in reaching any of
the members of the "College" with his spiritual message. In
fact, his emphasis upon theology and doctrine, his lack of
tact, and his enthusiasm to reach grays could under his
eyes-- "Mr. Burton was not asking me paid chaplain, but as
the pastor who had the care of all grays in his parish" (XV:
ch.1 emphasis mine)-- are qualities which combine to rob him
of any capacity for sympathy for these people. Every
mention Lane has to the people at the "College" has a note
of familiarity to it: he leaves part of himself with
these people because he is unable to see one part of himself
in them. Instead, he imposes judgments which are outside
of himself: he attempts to correct, to make right, to make
whole. For example, to Mrs. Birch, who has a weakness for
stuff, he notes, "So your stuff is all gone, eh? . . . Ah,
well, you'll soon be going where there is no more stuff"

[14: ch.2]. Indeed, the narrator notes that Mrs. Wick's use of staff was not just a simple indulgence and even a paralytic stepson to explain that indeed it offered a kind of spiritual enhancement for her. "It seemed to be an ennobling power, helping her soul to do the office of saint" [15: ch.2]. Mrs. Wick is fostering sympathetic responses between his parishioners, Mrs. Wick is the only way he knows of handling conflict. With an authoritarian note of benevolence and certainty about it, his command of "silence" to the kicking Mr. Spratt and Miss Fudge over the behavior of Miss Fudge's son reveals that he has no desire to encourage sympathetic bonds between them. Indeed, this particular contradiction is so disagreeable to him that he leaves the college abruptly so as to avoid any other disputes between parishioners. There appears then to be a completeness to Mrs. Wick's actions and interactions with others. "Mr. Barton . . . was determined to witness no more division between her and Mr. Spratt. He, saying good morning to the latter, he hastily left the college" [16-17: ch.2 emphasis mine]. Moreover, we see Mrs. Wick's own ideas concerning her "Bible of Humanity" working here. While showing Mrs. Wick's exclusively spiritual response to the conflict, she also shows how that response is devoid of any immediate, sympathetic human message, particularly for a boy of seven.

"If you will be a good boy, God will love you, and

you will grow up to be a good man. Now, let us hear next Thursday that you have been a good boy." Master Fodge had no distinct vision of the benefit that would accrue to him from this change of course. (83: 28.2)

And the young boy has no "distinct vision of the benefit" of the clergyman's attitude because as a spiritual leader, Anne is unable to make the spiritual realm attainable to these very ordinary people attracted to him. According to W.G. Rutherford, "Anne Norton . . . cannot adapt his otherworldly religion to his surroundings" and points out that the Reverend Martin Cleave, one other clergyman mentioned in the story, seems to be more in touch with the people in his community in part because he "is a capable farmer, able to discuss the relation of crops" (44: 28.1).

Unlike Anne, the Reverend Cleave then succeeds in seeing the otherness of his congregants in himself because part of his daily task, farming, is not so far removed from them. And the narrator is sure in pointing out this success.

Mr. Cleave is the plainest and least clerical-looking of the party; yet, strange to say, there is the true parish priest, the pastor beloved, committed, relied on by his flock . . . thought of as the surest helper under a difficulty, as a monitor who is encouraging rather than severe.

Mr. Claven has the wonderful art of presenting
 anyone which the whiteright and the blackside
 can understand. (Hr: ch.4)

And most importantly, the Reverend Claven can share the
 sympathies and convey an understanding of the people with
 whom he works.

[He is] a man, you observe, who has most likely
 sprung from the harder-working sections of the
 white class, and has hereditary sympathies with
 the checkered life of the people (Hr: ch.4
 emphasis mine).

And like the minister, Mr Claven extends his sympathies
 to Anne's troubles, the only good response in the story to
 do so. For example, while Mr Ely, Mr John, Mr Parsons, Mr
 Fellows, and Mr Pugh are quick to criticize Anne,
 specifically concerning the scandal which has been stirred
 up concerning Caroline Carlinski's prolonged stay at the
 vicarage and her supposed affairs with Anne, only Mr Claven
 has a sympathetic response to their very apprehensive
 accusations. "Well the poor fellow must have a hard pull to
 get along, with his small income and large family. Let us
 hope the Countess does something towards making the pot
 boil" (Hr: ch.4). Instead of seeing the Countess's stay as
 a scandalous event, he is able to sympathetically imagine a
 part of himself in that very situation.

Billy Barnes: A Precursor of An Angel

Eliot therefore has told the Association for the necessity of sympathy within this small community and while as an objective observer she can expose both the community's lack of sympathy for Anne and Anne's lack of sympathy for his congregation, there is still the need for an active character who is capable of seeing one's self in others, of extending a part of one's self in order to share in the suffering of others. This character is Anne's wife, Billy Barnes, and in no other place of fiction by Eliot do we see the likes of Billy again. At first glance, Billy appears to be the quintessential subject of certainty, the perfect Angel in the House, but I will state that the completeness of Billy's angelic nature is indeed a byproduct of Anne's own need to have wholeness and certainty in his life and that this completeness, this certainty which surrounds Billy, is the cause of his untimely death. I will also state that it is possible for Billy to be an angelic character and still, on her own initiative, be a productive, experientially interactive mother, wife, housekeeper and neighbor who is able to see a part of others in herself and to extend a part of herself to others.

Mrs. Amelia Barnes's ideal moral qualities make her a literary figure who is difficult to forget. Her perfect physical description matches the perfect moral attributes and capacity for experiencing sympathy which Eliot endows her

with. Indeed, her physical description successfully matches her moral character. Being what is the most perfect female figure from the church as her likeness, Emily's beauty, gentleness, and demure are as easily recognized and as mystically unobtainable as the Madonna's. We idealized her as if the woman who was Mary, mother of Jesus.

She was a lovely woman....a large, fair, gentle Madonna, with thick, close, chestnut curls beside her well-rounded cheeks, and with large, tender, short-sighted eyes. The flowing lines of her tall figure made the simplest dress look graceful, and her old frayed black silk seemed to repose on her bust with a placid elegance and sense of distinction. (14; 46, 5)

Yet Emily is as far from like the Madonna, and is not worshipped and revered, as the Virgin Mary is, by the Catholic church. Instead, Eliot's portrayal of Emily is more in line with the human woman who was Mary, a mother and wife. Nonetheless, there is an unmistakable, mystic quality about Emily, similar to that of the Madonna, which enables us to see her as an unobtainable, ungraspable being. Though she does create the analogy between Emily and the Madonna (Emily is a "fair and gentle Madonna"), Eliot carefully undercuts any sense of certainty which may well may be attributed to this seemingly perfect paragon of womanhood. She is very careful not to allow Emily to receive the same reverence which the

Catholic church offers the Virgin Mary. In order to explain this uncertain and mystical characteristic of Mary, I suggest that Eliot uses part of the Madonna or Virgin Mother image of womanhood and part of the Victorian Angel in the house image--another image of certainty--to portray Mary.

The idea that the angel--not the absolute Angel of Country Paterson's "Angel in the House," but the angels found in the Old and New Testaments--is in a position of uncertainty, conceivably, was examined by Lewis himself in The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis (1954), a work in which he refers to "intermediary beings--oracles, omens, and even higher forms of these ambiguous mediators" as subjects of uncertainty (18). These "higher forms of ambiguous mediators"--the angels--are the subject of Stuart Schindler's detailed Lacanian study on angels, entitled An Angel's Dream (1984). Schindler claims that the position the angels played throughout the Judeo-Christian history is one that is confused, and full of uncertainty:

They are not . . . central figures in the Bible; they do not belong to the first family of Christianity or Judaism usually they are intermediaries, messengers or ministers. (16)

They were the indirect way in which God communicated with humans. "As soon as God gave up speaking directly to mortals, . . . it was necessary to have a company of angels pass between him and his creatures" (17). This way

uncertain way of seeing again offers us the opportunity to see Willy, too, break the certainty surrounding the social label in the House. We might say that that Willy represents an angel which is part celestial--that which is beyond human understanding--and part human--a perception of something spun out of a Victorian social ideal.

The work is rife with examples of Willy's angelic nature. For example, the presence of her own children about her suggest her physical angelic characteristics. When she is ill, Nicky "furtively [strokes] and [kisses] the soft white hand" (23; Ch.3 emphasis mine). He appears to recognize the angelic nature of his mother--that nature which is beyond human understanding or, according to Isaac, "in essence," for when Willy asks him why he is kissing her hand, Nicky answers, with the honest and accurate perception that only a child can have, "It is so lovely" (24; Ch.3 ~~Willy's~~ emphasis). Nicky's naturally childlike perception that his mother's hand is "so lovely" is an indication that even he recognizes that there is something "active" within her nature, that lies even within her physical beauty. In a similar way, her very nature, her inward self, is correspondingly beyond human definition and understanding: "Something, something more of quietness, something which surpasses all accomplishments, all ~~accomplishments~~" (24; Ch.3 emphasis mine). But as simple as Willy himself might first appear, even in her angelic way,

Eliza does not portray her daily routine, as she does Anne's, as one that is perceived as illusory. Eliza attributes her angelic nature, in fact, to the very ordinariness of her duties as wife and mother. Indeed, in this passage, Eliza suggests that the only beings to recognize the multiple parts of her human self which she extends to others, despite her very human concerns about food and clothing for her family, are the angels themselves.

Her body was very weary, but her heart was not heavy, in spite of Mr. Woods the butcher, and the transitory nature of when-besides; for her heart so overflowed with love, she felt sure she was near a fountain of love that would ever for husband and babes better than she could deserve; so she was soon asleep. But about half past five o'clock in the morning, if there were any angels watching round her bedroom angels might be glad of such an office--they saw Mrs. Norton rise up quickly, careful not to disturb the slumbering Anne, who was snoring the more of the just, light her candle, prop herself upright with the pillow, throw the warm sheet round her shoulders, and renew her attack on the heap of unburned stockings. (Her chest expands once)

Nevertheless, the certainty of her angelic nature, Eliza suggests, is a result of her choice to marry Anne.

"Mrs. Burton's nature would never have grown half-an angel if she had married the man you would perhaps have had in your eye for her--a man with sufficient income and personal merit" (55; ch. 3 emphatic mine). And the angelic qualities Elliot attributes her with are not detrimental until Anne's illusions of whiteness, enhanced by Caroline Burrowski's own illusions of whiteness, turn Willy's prodigious angelic nature into an illusion itself.

Still, while Willy is able to act as an angel on earth, there are many pages of her nature which are just as human as those pages which are quite angelic. For example, Elliot notes that "Willy took a little toward angels" (71; ch. 3) when John, the nervous man-servant, spills gravy on her best black silk gown at a dinner party at Caroline Burrowski's home. And the servant is clear to point out that she has a weakness which may be the cause of this response.

It was a pretty woman's weakness--she was fond of dress; and when, when she was looking up her economical billows, she had romantic visions how nice it would be to put on really handsome stylish things--to have very stiff halious sleeves, for example, without which a woman's dress was thought in those days. (49; ch.3)

Furthermore, as a poor clergyman's wife and mother of six, she serves a multiplicity of very human roles. She is a concerned mother who sympathetically feels the pain of her

child's needs. For example, she says to the Countess, "Poor Fred must have some new shoes! I wouldn't let him go to Mrs Bond's yesterday because his toes were peeping out, dear child! and I can't let him walk anywhere except in the garden... Really, boots and shoes are the greatest trouble of my life" (88; ch.1). She is also a thrifty sewer, underserving, nonetheless, her own ability to mend anything, and making the observation that "there's no mending boots and shoes to look better than they are" (87; ch.2). The reader sees that she is a creatively thrifty sewer who sacrifices the time and talent needed for her own worn shoes in order to repair those of her children.

Mrs. Barton was playfully underserving her skill in mendsomising boots and shoes. She had on that morn'g on her feet a pair of slippers whinnied many age lived through the growth phase of their existence, and were now running a respectable career as shoes with slippers, having been partly covered with that material by Mrs. Barton's own neat slippers. Wonderful slippers those! They were never empty. (87; ch.2)

She is an obedient wife who helps her husband's rule in the community by covering books for the lending library, who "fetches" Anne's dressing gown at his command, and who keeps the noisy hordes of children away from him when he "wants to be quiet" (84; ch.2). Added all this, and with the extra

work placed upon her by the Countess Chirivski's egotistic need to obey in the Russian household because she feels offended by her brother's "lively" marriage to her own maid, Milly is an ~~unimaginative~~ worker. And the narrator suggests in this passage that though Milly may appear to be the ideal, quiet, unassuming worker, she overlooks the fact that Anne cannot acknowledge the work she does if she does it all in secret. Thus we see part of Milly's human nature and what appears to be quite a total, amiable nature.

I can hardly begin to think of all the rough work she did with those lovely hands--all by the way, without letting her husband know anything about it, and husbands are not clairvoyant; how she salted bacon, ironed shirts and cravats, put patches on patches, and re-darned dimes. Then there was the task of taking [sic] out baby-linen in prospect. (14; ch.7 emphatic voice)

As we have seen with Anne, this shows how this goodling, well-meaning town can be unsympathetically aware of the otherness of the people within it, unable to extend a part of themselves to others. It is only Milly who does have this sympathetic awareness of otherness, and the Countess Chirivski challenges this noble quality which she possesses. (As to the illusions which she helps to perpetuate within Anne's already illusory nature, the Countess harnesses the source of all gossip concerning both

Just as well as Billy in the second half of the story. The Countess feeds Jane's illusions concerning his effectiveness as a surgeon, which in turn blinds Jane to the reality of the town's perception of their relationship. And in the process, the Countess also takes advantage of that very same, fragrantary nature with which Billy is endowed. Mr. Farquhar, one of the town's most vicious gossipers, (who first creates with a noticeable limp, perhaps to add a note of humor, or perhaps to underscore by a physical flaw his moral failing, his lack of sympathy), reveals the way in which Jane's illusions concerning his relationship with the Countess have affected the town's perception of not only Jane but Billy as well.

You have only to look at that woman to see what she is--throwing her eyes about when she comes into church, and looking in a way to attract attention . . . Elizabeth Farquhar is very fond of Elizabeth Barton, and it's quite distressing that she should sympathize with such a woman, who she attacked him on the most proper point. (75; ch.2)

Even Jane, who is frequently the very subject of gossip, is also seen as the perpetrator of gossip. Completely unaware of the way in which the town is perceiving the Countess's prolonged stay at the Parsonage, Jane makes suggestions about one of the very men she has engaged in gossip

concerning him. After the clerical meeting, to Billy he makes the innuendo that Mr Hip will naturally be carrying names: "Hip's a big dog; he'll like that" (200 ch.10). And when he comments, almost in a gossiping way, about Mrs Forgher's own propensity to gossip about Mr Whitson and the Countess, Billy's only response is: "Dear me, why will people take so much pains to find out evil about others?" (201 ch. 11). Indeed, Billy is the one person who extends herself to others, who recognizes the damage of isolating others by gossip, and who attempts to see a part of others' sufferings within herself.

This extension of herself appears to have much to do with the fragmentary way in which she approaches people who are suffering. For example, when the Countess Charleski frenziedly throws herself on the mercy of the Sisters for the mistreatment she believes her brother has done her, Billy, "having really heard of worse conduct, . . . struggled against her desire for a direct," perhaps sympathetic and complete answer to a question she has already totally answered herself: "Did you ever hear of anything as disagreeable? as mortifying? as disagreeable?" (204 ch.12 emphasis mine). Yet the complete, total, self-removed Countess has no understanding of or desire for sharing her self with another; her desire is to locate the other actually, not to be a part of another. And the illusion she has of her challenges most certainly enters

Milly's health deteriorate. Infused with a tone of irony, this passage reveals how the Countess's illusions of her role in the household simply feed her ego and increase the work which Milly has to do.

So, though she lay in bed till ten, and came down to a separate breakfast at eleven, she kindly consented to rise as early as five, when a hot joint was prepared, which could furnish forth the children's table the next day; she considerably prevented Milly from devoting herself too closely to the children, by insisting on reading, talking, and walking with her; and she even began to anticipate a boy for the next baby, which most certainly be a girl, and be named Caroline. (187: 28-7)

Moreover, the Countess feeds Jane's own illusions concerning his success as a clergyman, illusions which are grounded before she comes to stay in their home. In an early scene, during their dinner at her home, the Countess responds to Jane's performance as a clergyman in the much way Jane wishes her to respond. Asking whether she would like to read his Christmas sermon which was printed in The Pall Mall. The Countess responds:

I shall quite value the opportunity of reading that sermon. There was such depth in all--such argument! It was not a sermon to be heard only

own. I am delighted that it should become
 generally known, as it will be, now it is printed
 in The Faigie. (20: ch.10)

When she is living in his household, however, these very
 illusions prevent him from seeing the damage which she is
 causing Willy. Even as the "fifty witnesses . . . [of]
 gossip [delusion] the reputation of the Rev. Isaac Barton"
 (20: ch. 11), the illusions which the Countess has created
 for his son still enough for him to rationalize her
 continued residence at the Vicarage.

He still believed in the Countess as a charming
 and influential woman, disposed to husband him,
 and in any case, he could hardly list departure to
 a lady guest who had been kind to him and his, and
 she might any day spontaneously announce the
 termination of her visit. (20: ch.11)

While surrounded by all of this illusion, Willy still is
 much more aware of the effect the Countess's presence is
 having upon their reputation. In this passage, Eliot
 suggests that even this realistic awareness has a
 sympathetic response to it, for she is not concerned about
 the gossip for her own sake, but only for her husband's.

When time slipped on, and the Countess's visit did
 not end, Willy was not blinded to any phase of their
position. She knew of the slander she was sowing
 of the keeping away of old friends but these she

falls almost entirely on her husband's account.

(89) CH.2 separate lines).

It is the illusory perception that Milly should be ill, especially, to all, which is destructive, and when the part of her which is human is overlooked and overreached, Milot ironically suggests that she quite literally becomes the most certain of all angels, that is, a heavenly angel, in her death. Indeed, after her death, which is generally attributed by most of the community to the Countess's prolonged stay, the caretaker notes that: "No one breathed the Countess's name now: for Milly's memory haunted her husband, as of old the plane was haunted as which an angel from God had alighted" (111) CH.2 separate lines). It is Henry who, shortly before Milly dies, points out to the Countess the illusory perception she has concerning herself and concerning the way her visit has affected Milly's health, and in general, the Barton household. When the Countess indelicately asks Henry for some cream for her dog Jol, Henry is the one who breaks that illusion by pointing out that Milly is ill, a fact which has eluded the Countess for the duration of her stay. "Is Mrs Barton ill?" she innocently asks, a question to which Henry responds in detail, adding that she has brought an ill reputation upon their name on top of everything (100-101; 94-5). With this, the Countess immediately leaves. In this passage, Eliot reveals the drastic consequences of the Countess's stay,

consequences which affect Anne, yet most drastically, Milly, and her unborn child.

The Greshams had left, but also, the hills she had contributed to swell still remained; still did the exigency of the children's clothing, which was also partly an indirect consequence of her presence; and so, too, did the coolness and alienation in the parishioners, which would not at once vanish at before the fact of her departure. The Rev. MARTIN was not surprised--the past was not expunged. But what was worse than all,
Milly's death gave frequent cause for alarm, and
the prospect of baby's birth was now shadowed by
more than the usual fears. (184: ch.7 emphasis mine)

Within a week's time, Milly's baby and then Milly herself die. Milly's dying words to Anne suggest that she has all along recognized Anne' own need for certainty in his life. "My dear--dear--husband--you have been--very--good to me. You--dare--make me--very--happy" (184: ch.7). Her broken words reveal her desire to reassure him that he played a complete role in her life.

The tragic part of Anne' story, I believe, is that while his illusions concerning his certainty are destructive, both to his wife and to the fabric of the community, his intentions are always quite sincere. Moreover

do we see his more broken and more horrified by certainty than when he is experiencing the absolute certainty of his wife's death. Anne feels this certainty the most when he is in the direct presence of Willy's grave, the most certain mark of this tragic reality. His actions reveal his necessity for assurance that his life with her was not simply an illusion. We can see how he nearly recognizes the illusory wholeness and certainty that he has placed upon Willy.

The husband was now advancing towards the door
 round from which he was soon to be parted, perhaps
 for ever. He stood a few moments gazing after and
over again the words of his lastness, as if to
 assure himself that all the happy and sober part
was really. (114 ch.10 emphatic mine)

We also experience the certainty which only assurance can bring when he attains those last words to her: "Willy, Willy, don't thou hear me? I didn't love thee enough-- I wasn't tender enough to thee-- but I think of it all now" (114-115; ch.14). Even Eliot's narrative points out Anne's tragic inability to experience the sympathy necessary to share a life with Willy, who is so sympathetically giving. "Anne Burden had been an affectionate husband, and while Willy was with him, he was never visited by the thought that perhaps his sympathy with her was not quick and watchful enough . . . and he felt as if his love needed a pardon for its

poverty and selfishness" (111; ch.8).

Amos's story then for Eliot is tragic, for, endowed with a sympathetic wife, he was never able to offer sympathy and only feels its true meaning after she is gone. His physical actions during the time of Willy's death also reveal his realization that there are consequences to desiring certainty and completeness. The only certainty left of Willy is the certainty of the cold earth in which she lies. "Gradually, as his eyes dwelt on the words, 'Amos, the beloved wife,' the waves of feeling swelled within his soul, and he threw himself on the grass, clasping it with his arms, and kissing the cold turf" (114; ch.10). Indeed, Amos' reactions to Willy's death echo his own children's reactions to the loss of their mother. Almost like his children, (except for Perry), Amos cannot comprehend the finality and the certainty of Willy's death. The children "cried because mama was ill and papa looked so unhappy: but they thought, perhaps some good thing would be as they said Dr. Jo said Mummy seemed suddenly pained with the idea that mama was going away somewhere, his little heart swelled and cried aloud" (108; ch.8 emphasis mine).

Nevertheless, Eliot suggests that even Willy's death, the most certain of all things, is not at all certain. Willy doubts the certainty of death because she leaves a part of herself with Perry. Her love lives on in her eldest

daughter, and she bequeaths Betty her own role of angel, leaving her with these charges: "Betty, I'm going away from you. Love your papa. Comfort him; and take care of your little brothers and sisters. God will help you" (108; ch. 4). Indeed, Eliot suggests that a part of Milly's angelic nature does live on because it is now a part of Betty. "Milly did not take all her love from the earth when she died. She had left some of it in Betty's heart" (118; conclusion).

And Betty is not the only person who obtains the gift of sympathy from Milly, for the Shaparian community shows an outpouring of sympathy towards Anne after Milly has died. Eliot makes it clear that what the community does for Anne and her family is not simply good deeds but is a true expression of sympathetic resonance. Indeed, as Eliot links the specific deeds which various members of the community do for Anne and the children, she often uses the word "sympathy" and its various forms to describe them. Mr. Oldsport, for example, does not send only financial help, but along with it, extends his sympathetic understanding of both Anne's financial and emotional difficulties. More than the money, Eliot suggests, this seems to be the greatest gift Anne could receive from his neighbor. "Mr Oldsport wrote to express his sympathy, and enclosed another twenty-pound note, hoping that he might be permitted to contribute in this way to the relief of Mr Barton's mind from pecuniary

evolution" (111; ch.3 emphasis mine). Mr. Clifton too, along with thirty pounds sends "the kindest and most delicate words of Christian fellowship and manly friendship" (111; ch.3). Extending a part of themselves which recognizes the lack of Billy's motherly touch upon the children's lives, Miss Jackson, Mrs. Backit, and Miss Fargusson and her sister all take special interest in them. "Miss Jackson forgets old grievances, and comes to stay some months with Billy's children" (112; ch.4), and Mrs. Backit, who had once, "in a severe mood, . . . pronounced [Dicky] 'stoddy'," (121; ch.8) now is kind to Dicky in particular by having him stay with her. And Eliot suggests sympathy now exists between the woman and the young boy who never liked to kiss her because a greater understanding between them has been built. "What was the enlargement of Dicky's experience from that visit . . . so that Dicky had considerably modified his views as to the desirability of Mrs. Backit's kisses" (123; ch.4). And the Fargusson sisters, who had previously taken delight in pointing out Anne's faults, now sympathetically extend a part of themselves to two of Anne's children, Fred and Dicky. "The Misses Fargusson made particular pets of Fred and Dicky, to whom they undertook to give lessons twice a week in writing and geography; and Mrs. Fargusson devised song books for the little ones" (112; ch.4). In all of these instances of community outreach, Eliot makes it clear that the people are not simply being killed, but are also

sympathetically extending a part of themselves to the other in the process. And it is because of Milly's death that the community responds this way. Her death that can be seen as a byproduct of, not a necessary for, the sympathetic response Anne receives.

Eliza shows very powerfully in this piece of fiction the necessity of suffering which one must undergo in order to gain a sympathetic understanding. Milly's suffering ends with the most certain of all results: that is, death. Though her suffering has a positive result since a part of her does live on in Betty. Anne's suffering causes a sympathetic transformation of the community: those people who once saw him as annoying and unsympathetic to their needs, now attempt to understand his suffering and to ease the blow. Yet Eliza's story removes Anne from the midst of these people who now understand and care for him, people who know what suffering and losses he has experienced. Less than a year after Milly's death and the community's sympathetic outpouring of understanding and love, Anne receives a letter informing him that a Mr. Garpe would be taking over his money and that he will be moved to another country where "the parish was in a manufacturing town, where his walks would lie among noisy streets and dingy alleys, and where the children would have no garden to play in, no pleasant houses to visit" (115; ch.18). And though Eliza recognizes that this relocation is felt most painfully by Anne who has

now tasted the sweetness of sympathy, "O, it was hard! Just when Stoppardas had become the place where he most wished to stop-- where he had friends who knew his sorrows-- where he lived close to Hilip's grave" (112: ch.18), she also recognizes that this painful experience demonstrates the community's ability to offer sympathy and suggests that this feeling also creates the closest bond that Anne has or will ever have with a congregation.

There was general regret among his parishioners at his departure: not any one of them thought his spiritual gifts pre-eminent, or was conscious of great edification from his ministry. But his recent troubles had called out their better sympathies and that is always a source of love. Anne failed to reach the spring of goodness by his sorrows, but he touched it effectively by his sorrows: and there was now a new bond between him and his flock. (113: ch.18 emphasis mine)

And for the first time, Eliot notes, Anne's sorrows could stir up the sympathy "among the poorer class of parishioners," a class he had never been able to reach before (113: ch.18). "Old stiff-jointed Mr Tress" sympathetically notes that Anne's position in a new parish will be such worse in a place where he is not known. "Oh, poor soul, . . . I'm sorry for us. He hadn't such here, but he'll be worse off there. Half a loaf's better no'n

us" (114; ch.10). Though Eliot takes Anne, the recipient of sympathy, away from that community which has learned to offer it, she supposes that Anne's suffering this brief separation from those who now sympathetically understand him does appear to have some validity to it because that same suffering was what sensitized the community's awareness to their own lack of sympathy. And she does, through the sympathetic narrator, recognize the harshness of such a removal, as the narrator notes that Anne is a man who experienced "the separation from the loved and familiar" (114) and also notes that this removal "was another blow inflicted upon the bruised man" (113; ch.10). Eliot's message concerning sympathy then in "The Sad Fortunes of the Rev. John Barton" seems to be that it is even better to learn to offer sympathy than it is to receive sympathy. Anne's growth in sympathy, then, is a direct result of his intense emotional suffering because it releases sympathy in the community.

Whether Anne learns to offer sympathy or to understand othersness is difficult to discern in this stark "noveau." In the conclusion, Eliot does imply that he receives a fragment of Billy's sympathetic understanding and love because it is carried on through Peggy who dutifully shapes her mother's dying request to do so. On the other hand, Eliot also implies that Anne is still seeing things within an illusory wholeness, even ten years after Billy's death. He is still

seeking out certainty. In fact, she suggests that Anna boards the part of Billy which is left to him. Though Patty, like her mother before her, does not complain, we do see that Patty has inherited Billy's role as sympathetic angel. This is clear in the following passage, extracted from a long explanation of how the other children are residents of community sympathy.

Patty's trust was to stay at home, or walk about with her paper and when he was by the fire in an evening, after the other children were gone to bed, she would bring a stool, and, placing it against his feet, would sit down upon it and lean her head against his knee. Then his hand would rest on that fair head, and he would feel that Billy's love was not quite gone out of his life. (118; ch. 3 episode nine).

And the final passage of the novel suggests that while Mr Richard "Rickey" Norton had become an engineer and all of the other children "were now grown up, and had gone their several ways" (118; conclusion), Patty is set in a role which is quite similar to her mother's previous one for "Patty alone remains by her father's side and makes the evening sunshine of his life" (118; conclusion). Visiting her mother's grave with her father, Patty actually resembles her mother both in physical appearance and, as Elsie suggests, in emotional and physical strain.

He held on his arm a young woman, with a sweet, quiver face, which strongly recalled the expression of Mrs. Barlow's, but was less lovely in form and colour. She was about thirty, but there were some premature lines around her mouth and eyes, which told of early anxiety. (116: Conscience mystic's view)

Early obeys Milly's request to serve, almost sacrificially, though apparently happily, as a part of herself when she is gone.

Eliot does not give us a glimpse of any other angels like Milly in her works. Nor do we see again the simplistic certainty of the characters which she creates with the Quaker Caroline Burleigh. What we do see, however, are more realistic, perhaps more believable, though very tragic characters who, like Jane, tend to exist solely as an illusory source of certainty and wholeness which they find necessary for their lives.

"JANET'S REPENTANCE"

DISSENTING OPINIONS: THE ROLE OF THE LONG-ABSENT JOHN BARNES

In June of 1857, Marian Lewis and John Blackwood the first part of her final "novel," "Janet's Repentance". The uncertainty surrounding the final publication of the entire story hovered over both Marian and Blackwood for months, as their correspondence dances with one another reveal their differing attitudes towards the portrayal of the three main characters (Janet, Tryon, and Geopeter) and the credibility of their problems. In various letters to Marian, Blackwood complained that Janet's alcoholic husband was "unconventional" (*Letters* II 144) and "unpoetic" (144) and continued to find Janet's alcoholism a difficult problem to sympathize with. His put on the word "spiritual" in the following quotation suggests that even the severity of Janet's private personal problems, which Eliza associated metaphorically with her physical craving for "spirits," made it difficult for him to "deal with" the heroine. "My sympathies are not easily enlisted on the side of a woman with 'spiritual weakness'" (178). Furthermore, his preference for a "pleasant picture" (144) of English country town life and his objections to Geopeter, "[a] rather too hardened brute" to his suffering wife, made him criticize this particular story as one that "is not too

common" (144). And he continued to pick away at the foundation of the story, striking at Eliot's portrayal of clergymen and their theology. "What are you going to give us a really good active working clergyman, neither absurdly evangelical nor absurdly High Church?" (145).

Fear free to her desire to portray country clergymen in the most realistic and most unapologetically true fashion, Marian, still only known to Blackwood as "George Eliot," responds to her editor: "The collision in the drama is not between 'bigotries churchmanship' and evangelicism, but between irreligion and religion . . . I thought I had made it apparent in my sketches of Willey's feelings . . . that the conflict lay between immorality and morality--irreligion and religion. Mr. Topsy will carry the reader's sympathy" (147). Fearing that Eliot would stop the series, and claiming that "I do not fall in with George Eliot's every day" (147), Blackwood, whose initial response had been prompted after having read only Part I of the "Secret" series, toned down his critical remarks, but also explained the necessity of them. "Of course I will say when I think you are failing to produce the effect you intend or otherwise mising the mark, but unless you write seriously from the heart of your own genius or knowledge or observation it would not be worth my while to make any comment at all" (148-2 emphasis mine). Eliot's response indicates that she understands the desire of her editor and is thankful that he

is more gentle with his comments. "Thanks for your kind letter. It shows that you have understood me and will give me confidence for the future" (293). Blackwood's remarks explaining both his role and the necessity of that role in the reviewing process of her work, however, prompt questions concerning the way Eliot does reveal her self as a less obtrusive yet still a clearly male presence in her narrative of "Janet's Repentance". This new approach to the narrative also allows us to analyze her rethinking of her doctrine of sympathy.

Unlike the uncertainty surrounding the gender and identity of the narrator of "Anna Barker," the narrator of "Janet's Repentance" is much more certainly male gendered and much more certainly presented as a participant of Milby life, for he is looking back on one who was once a young boy who lived in Milby. He is a less obtrusive narrator, perhaps, because he is a participant of Milby life and does not feel the burden of filling in the moral gaps--the lack of sympathy--created by his fellow townsman. He is a fellow townsman. Though this particular type of narrator recognizes the lack of sympathy within the Milby community, he does not feel the need to sympathetically intervene, as did the narrator of *Anna*, on its behalf. For example, instead of encouraging his readers to join him in sympathizing with the heavily criticized person, Mr. Cross, who was seen as "strange" and who was "not spoken of in high

respect" (188; ch.1), the narrator only rather off-handedly notes this lack of sympathy, and depicts the people of Wilby in such a way that this lack appears to be more or less an endemic part of this society. "The parishioners are so stupid at all why it should be desirable to venerate the person of Jesus Christ they were much more comfortable to [also] look down a little at their fellow-creatures" (188; ch.1). Instead of appropriating her characters to be sympathetic by means of her narrative, Eider simply states the deficiencies in sympathy and accepts them as a way of life. Her functioning as both male narrator and male participant in Wilby, however, offers her a more credible voice with which to speak on behalf of women.

The more obvious weakness of "Janet's" narrator has prompted several feminist explanations of the novella and the fact that it was written by a woman. Gillian Beer, for example, refers to the narrator's appropriation of "masculinizing" male manners in Janet as serving to "reinforce the 'masculine' prevalence of the writing and playfully to denigrate that persona" (190). And Jessica Barak also claims that "the pseudonymous writer of this novel emphasizes his masculine qualities" because "Marina Lewis needed a mask behind which she might freely develop a public authorial identity" (138). While both of these commentaries say much about George Eider's masculine public persona, they do not address fully the role of the narrator and his

connection to the lives of the characters. They fail to observe an important picture of the distinction of references by the narrator's salience. Indeed, there is truly little that is "wrenchbackling" about the narrator's male characteristics. The references, though distinctly marking the narrator as male, are few and far between and primarily refer to his dress or boyhood contact during regular church occasions as to his own confirmation ceremony. It should be noted, in fact, that the instances of the narrator's recognizable male numerisms tend to be followed by his commentary on the condition of the lives of his female peers.

Three times we see this happening, and all times the male narrator, thinking back to his boyhood days as a young member of Elly's church, offers commentary on the poor quality of education for the young girls of his generation, thus suggesting that the emphasis upon fashion and beauty are contributing factors to the superficiality of his peers. In the first instance, the narrator makes reference to the regular Sunday morning worship services and the communal spirit the "maining event" (154) (Ch.I) entails among the young people who come prepared to exhibit their feathered hats, their gloves, their new slapping dresses, their new diamond rings and their gilt shirt buttons, making quite clear that the superficiality of this exhibition is not PRINCE + feminine fascination. "The young gentlemen, too,

were not without their little Sunday displays of costumes, of a limited masculine kind" (184: ch.1). The narrator takes his science quite apart in this scene when he says "I remember . . . thinking Miss Lander was laughing at me for appearing in cost-balls for the first time" (184: ch.4). Yet the narrator also takes a point of noting that though the "charming well-bred Indian" can speak French well enough to conduct "conversations in that language in the presence of their less instructed sisters" (184: ch.4), the young women are in danger of becoming lost in the traditional trappings of a purely feminine education, one which emphasizes beauty and speaking beautiful languages over a more challenging education which emphasizes the sciences. This is a point of contention which Miss Edmonson more fully in The Hill at the Flood when we see Maggie yearning to have the same opportunity to study the sciences as her brother Tom. Moreover, Maggie's gesture of cropping off her long locks, in rebellion against her female lot, reminds us that Miss had, since "Frost's Repentance," dealt more fully with the problematic of women's physical appearance overshadowing, or in "poor" Maggie's case, somehow sadly reflecting their mental capacities. We see the problematic clearly set forth in this passage of "Frost's Repentance".

This youthful generation was not particularly literary. The young ladies who trained their

hair, and gathered it all into large barrettes in front of their heads, leaving their sculptural region exposed without ornament . . . dressed as virgins that their daughters would read a selection of German poetry, and be able to express an appreciation for Schiller. (154: ch.8)

These concerns are noted by a male member of Wilby and it is important to keep in mind that the narrator and the young ladies of whom he speaks are the mother's guests. Though he notes that his "poetical generation," including females and males, was not "literary," he expounds at length on the specific literary plight of his female guests:

The second and third instances where the narrator presents himself as certainly male occur in chapters six and seven, within the setting of the narrator's confinement as a member of the Wilby church. As in the previous example, the narrator makes his gender known to us by telling us what he is now allowed to wear: "Several of us had just assumed crab-tails" (151: ch.6), which is a reference signifying that the Victorian boy has reached manhood. He also lets his audience know by telling us that he and Ned Flagg ministered during the ceremony and later at home attempted to imitate the bishop's (Mr. Funderquist's) voice, a man who "read the liturgy in a strikingly sonorous and uniform voice, which I began to imitate the next Sunday at home, until my little sister began to cry, and said I was 'gawling

of her" (184; ch.7). It is worthwhile to note that the young male narrator is imitating another man's voice while Eliot herself is imitating the voice of a young man. Here again we see the multiplicity of Eliot: her voice is twice removed in this instance as she is a woman imitating a young boy who is imitating an older man.

Moreover, as in the previous instance, she takes the opportunity to allow the male voice to speak both for the potential he sees existing in women through his observations of the arbitrary and arbitrary the way in which women are so easily overlooked and taken lightly in such serious occasions. Here, Eliot first uses the example of "poor Mary Dunn" who has been "excluded from every game at ball, to be obliged to walk with some not fifteen girls," all because her parents have chosen to send her to be prepared for confirmation "over and above" the preparation given to the other girls at school with Miss Fensley (184; ch.8). In the following passage, the male narrator makes a strong statement concerning the lack of equality among young men and women in educational training, and he uses the unsympathetic ridicule which Mary receives from her fellow schoolmates as a way of commenting on that inequality.

It is really surprising that young ladies should not be thought competent to the same curriculum as young gentlemen. I observe that their parents of means are quite equal; and if there had been a

periodical society for young gentlemen at Millly, I am inclined to think that, notwithstanding superficial and the classics, the party spirit there would not have exhibited itself in more pompous living, or more exclusive actions, than was found in Miss Twesley's society. (181: ch.5)

through her narrative, which appears to be saying that the existing type of education reserved for young women tends to promote "inactive action" and "pompous living" among its pupils more than that kind of education reserved for young men. Moreover, in this same scene, the narrator notes a great distinction between the way in which the young women have this sacred occasion and the way in which the young men passively take a part in it, believing that its solemnity should be reserved only for the girls.

I wish I could say that the solemnity of our feelings was on a level with the solemnity of the occasion; but alas! our boys find it difficult to recognise spiritual distinctions in their developed form, and I fear our chief emotion concerning the ceremony was a sense of sheepishness, and our chief opinion . . . that it ought to be confined to the girls. (181: ch.13)

Again, the narrator points out the accidental or arbitrary emphasis placed upon women, and it appears that only he can recognize the irony, when, during the confirmation ceremony,

to believe that the bishop's hands do not touch the girls' heads. "Instead of laying them on the girls' heads, [he] just let them hover over each in quick succession, as if it were not obligatory to touch them, and as if the laying on of hands were like the theatrical entrance-part of the play, and not to be really believed in" (191; ch.4). The irony lies in the fact that the same girls to whom the boys have passed the responsibility of reserving the entire tone of the ceremony are being denied the content, the very content, i.e., the laying on of hands for the blessing, of the ceremony itself.

We see then, as we did in her journalistic career, Eliot's need to speak as a man for women. Her less obtrusive male narrator serves less and less as the arbiter of sympathy, very much unlike the narrator we see in "Jacob Barton," who feels the responsibility of filling in the gaps left by Jacob's unsympathetic parishioners. Yet the narrator of "Jacob's Repentance" is much more obtrusive than his predecessor in expressing concern for women. I suggest that Eliot deliberately speaks as a male-making special use of the male voice in order to express the struggles of women's plight in general without being dismissed as a mere spokesman of her own sex.

In chapter two, I showed that the role of the narrator of "Jacob Barton" is to express sympathy for those characters who are unable to do so. We see this responsibility working

powerfully in the sympathetic narrator-clergyman of that story.

While Eliot's creed concerning the responsibility of the truly sympathetic towards those unable to express sympathy is still working in "Israel's Repentance," we also see that by this time, the narrator is much less obtrusive and his role in the working out of sympathy much less necessary than it was in "Israel's Son." Now Eliot is much more confident in allowing her characters to work through problems concerning lack of sympathetic interaction. As Corbin has pointed out, the narrator of the *Scenes* is no longer a spectator as in "Israel's Son"; he has in "Israel's Repentance" "become a character, a young boy confirmed by the bishop on the day that Tryon is granted permission to deliver his evening lectures" (121). As I have argued in last chapter, the narrator of "Israel's Son" moves beyond his role as spectator in the first two chapters and becomes a sympathetic narrator because of the sympathetic clerical affinity he shares with the clerical hero, Aaron. He therefore speaks, sympathetically, for those who cannot. However, the narrator of "Israel's Repentance" does not offer sympathy for those who, like Aaron, are incapable of interacting sympathetically. Instead, the narrator in this "scene" allows the characters themselves to work through what I claim to be problems concerning a misunderstood sympathy: that is, characters may understand their actions

to be sympathetic when in reality they are merely experiencing a more simplistic pity. This freedom from the more obvious narrative allows the deepest kind of human interaction to unfold and what results is a much clearer understanding of what pity and sympathy really are. Moreover, Eliot shows us how confusing the two can result in a less fulfilling human relationship.

For Eliot, this appears to be a clarification within her own doctrine of sympathy of what sympathy is, for I claim that in "Waste Barton," she literally used the words "sympathies" and "sympathy" as catchwords to describe many kinds of human feelings and fellowship, and that she had not yet fully developed the distinction between sympathy and pity. Eliot clearly makes the distinction in "Janet's Repentance" between simple pity, which, defined, is that which enters into another's suffering only and desires its end—a feeling of tenderness aroused by the suffering or misfortune of another, and prompting a desire for its relief (222) and a more comprehensive sympathy—which is the state of being affected by the condition of another with a feeling similar to that of the other (222). Sympathy then, is a more religious, less finite, indeed, more limitless, we might say, type of involvement in another's life. We can see the expansive move Eliot has made in her "Doctrine of Sympathy" from her first "sermon" to her last. What Eliot loosely names "sympathies" in "Waste Barton," she now

specifically name "pity" in "Janet's Repentance," for she shows us that she is dealing with a much more sophisticated and complex sympathy in her final "novel."

Authority, Discretion, and Sympathy

Robert Langston's Definition of Sympathy

As we follow Eliot's collection of diverse characters from "Jane Barker" to "Janet's Repentance" in the process of Charles Eliot, we can see that, as she reaches her final "novel," she fashionably deals with much more clearly defined forms of human interaction. Eliot clarifies her own "doctrine," specifically, by making a distinction in "Janet's Repentance" between sympathy and pity, ideas which were much more nebulous and in fact often used interchangeably in "Jane Barker." Yet by the time she had written "Janet's Repentance," her own notions concerning sympathy and its expression in her writing had become much clearer even to herself. In August, 1852, after having submitted "Janet's Repentance" to Blackwood, she writes to Mrs. Russell, "Writing is part of my religion, and I can write no word that is not prompted from within" (*Letters* II 277). She was quite aware that her own personal ideas concerning sympathy had influenced her writing and that she had to be true to her ideas and opinions as she continued to convey them through her art.

What we see in "Janet's Repentance" then, is Eliot's

doctrine of sympathy put into action, and this is seen through lively, active, moving and doing characters. Sympathy, or the lack, is not pondered upon or questioned about, as it is in "Some Sorts." According to Thomas Mann, Eliot's doctrine of sympathy "finds its fullest expression in 'Jest's' ignorance'" because we see the actual playing out of sympathy: "the plot," he continues, "is a dramatization of the idea" (72). In this particular "scene," no character is even physically visible than Robert Langston; however, no character displays a more destructive misconception of what sympathy is. His physical violence upon Jest is paralleled by the violence he heaps upon the housewife of Emily, who, most contrary to his brand of sympathy by ridiculing themselves of the Reverend Tryan: as he has a totalizing control over both his wife and the housewife of Emily. While the following sections of this chapter will examine how other characters, mostly Jest and her mother Mrs. Langston, also have misconceptions concerning what sympathy is, Eliot begins with the most obvious misinterpretation of Langston, because, I suppose, his power and influence are so far reaching and say, in effect, he is a factor contributing to Jest's own misconception of sympathy. Eliot therefore shows how Langston, from the beginning, has a misconceived notion of what fellowship and sympathy truly are as he attempts to impose his reality upon his fellow townsmen and then upon his wife. He has the

illusion that he is a part of their lives when in reality he is establishing himself as the only reality for their lives--

In this chapter argues that Eliot revisits the concept of sympathy and for clarification actually revises the word itself as "pity" in "Gertrude's Repentance." It seems appropriate to begin by analyzing a character who maliciously attacks Verne, ironically in the name of sympathy. In a sense, then, Inspector attempts to reinforce or pre-empt the moral principles which is as all important in Eliot's thinking. We might view the example of Inspector's deliberate redefinition or misdefinition of sympathy as Eliot's awareness of the need for clarification of these terms within her own doctrine, awareness that the word "sympathy" should be not one to be used lightly or as a catch-all phrase for any kind of good human interaction. The consequences of the lack of clarity are strikingly damaging, as we see within the framework of the story itself, because without such clarity about the difference between prescriptive pity and supportive sympathy, the certain destructiveness of a Inspector looms. And though the consequences of Eliot's former nebulous use of the word "sympathy" are not on a paring with Inspector's intentional misuse of the word and its concept, the comparison seems appropriate here since Inspector's in the very story in which Eliot boldly begins to expand the moral philosophy which continues to develop extensively through her later novels.

The fact that Deuphar does promote his own brand of "sympathy" by rallying many of the Synopsists against Tryon reveals that this well known lawyer is a rather established and evidently legitimate figure of authority in Wilby. This authority is thought to arise rather logically, from gradual knowledge and expertise. Nonetheless, Eliot notes in clear form page one, paragraph one, that this is a man whose notions of his own authority are quite illusory, as he continually imposes his own definitions of morality and church doctrine, denouncing the new pastor, Mr. Tryon. "But" said lawyer Deuphar . . . "as long as my Maker grants me power of voice and power of intellect, I will take every legal means to resist the introduction of dissolving, subversive doctrine into this parish" (Hf. ch.1). He claims power, which he equates with authority, and he assumes that his intellect matches his voice and the power of the legal system. As he pulls Mr. Tryon and Mr. Paulsson into his destructive rhetoric against the Reverend Tryon, we see early on his dissimulation with the power of stating and labeling that which he finds offensive or threatening.

Using as labeling the offensive person or concept enables Deuphar at least to feel that he has the certainty of control or authority over the situation, a certainty which laws would find illusory and Eliot apparently finds destructive to the sympathetic connection. He refers to Mr

Wynn as an Evangelical--a named group--which he in turn compares to a Presbyterian--another named group. He says: "Evangelicals are not Christians at all; they're no better than Presbyterians" (194b ch.1). An argument begins between himself and the two other men, who dispute the true definition of "the Presbyterians." The argument is worth citing in its entirety, as it reveals twice Hesperian's Illusion that he has the authoritative knowledge to offer the correct definition of the plausible noun. Twice he misunderstands the definitions which he so authoritatively offers in order to dispute another. The first time he offers the journalist definition.

'The Presbyterians,' said Mr Hesperian, in rather a louder tone than before, holding that every appeal for information must naturally be addressed to him, 'are a sect found in the reign of Charles I, by a man named John Presbyter, who hatched all the breed of dissenting vermin that crept about in dirty alleys, and corrupted the lord of the manor in order to get a few shillings for their pious-house conversions.' (194b ch.1)

And the second time he repeats Mr. Wynn's journalist definition: "Presbyterianism is derived from the word presbyter, meaning an elder" (194b ch.1). In his argument, he arrives at the name John Presbyter, whom he describes as a "plausible fanatic who wore a suit of leather, and went

about from town to village Immunizing the vulgar with the salubrious virus of Dissent!" by confusing John Knox, the founder of the Scottish Presbyterian Church, with George Fox, the founder of the Quakers, who wore a leather suit. Though he confuses everything from proper names to historical and religious information, he pursues the argument with the authority of one who certainly knows he is right, and when Mr. Tusliman, "in a conciliatory tone," responds to Mr. Nylan's correct answer, and offers to "finish" his encyclopedia, Inspector rebuts with authority. The voice of certainty speaks again, undermining the voice which was truly correct and which has the true authority, the encyclopedia, to back it up. "I don't care a straw, sir, either for you or your encyclopedia (sic) . . . a farago of false information, of which you picked up an imperfect copy in a scrap of waste paper. Will you tell me, sir, that I don't know the origin of Presbyterianism?" (144) (p. 11). He sees then how literary Inspector's authority is: not only does he see himself as the holder of all certain knowledge, of having all the answers, which is itself an illusion, but he also has the illusion that his knowledge is most certainly correct when ironically it is quite wrong.

Ellet shows further how Inspector's illusion of authority can be even more damaging. One of the other members of Wilby with whom he associates are not quite as threatening to his authority as Mr. Nylan and Mr. Tusliman.

In an illusory way, he interprets what is actually his manipulative authority as a genuine ability to share sympathy with his fellow transsexuals. When, for example, Dumpster substitutes a "you" speaker trying, armed with placards and caricatures of the dragqueen, another indication of his need to name or define people who do not measure up to his proper definitions. The shouts of support he receives reveal the certainty even they feel about his authority. From the crowd, cries of "Dumpster for arrest!" and "Silence!" "Hear him?" "He is, Dumpster!" (144) with the feeling of wholeness and certainty they have towards him and what he has to say. And later, when he is thinking of ways to turn the people away from Mr. Tryon's Sunday evening courses, the influential power of his certainty is seen as both Mr. Budd and Mr. Toulance agree to help boycott the lectures by threatening the people with what they work and do business. Mr. Budd claims, "I'll not keep a single worker on my ground who either goes to the lecture himself or lets anybody belonging to him go" (144) ch.11. And so too Mr. Toulance affirms, "No Virginia shall touch a sack or drive a wagon o' mine, that you say depend on. An' I know none besides us as are o' the same mind" (144) ch.11. They seem to be acquiring Dumpster's "absolution"; it is as if they have become infected by his mistaken need to reaffirm the town according to his sense of morality, and worse still, through his mistaken sense of sympathy.

In an ironic twist, in his speech before the town, Carpenter even uses the very language which is characteristic of Elliot's doctrine of sympathy. He refers to the crowd three times as his "fellow-townsmen," claiming that he is "speaking for" his respected colleagues. He appears to believe that he is a part of their lives, that he actually possesses the sympathetic characteristics of sharing fellow feeling. In the passage below indicated, however, Carpenter, misunderstanding his use of authority again, is actually speaking and feeling for the people, not with them.

Fellow-townsmen! It gives us the sincerest pleasure--I speak for my respected colleagues as well as myself--to witness these strong proofs of your attachment to the principles of our excellent Church, and your zeal for the honour of our venerable pastor. But it is no more than I expected of you. I know you well. I've known you for the last twenty years to be as honest and respectable a set of men as any in this country. Your hearts are sound to the core. No man had better try to thrust his snarl and hypocrisy down your throats.' (180-81 ch.4)

Carpenter is far from obtaining sympathy as Elliot would define it between himself and the townspeople or between the townspeople themselves; rather, he is doing all he can to break the town into battling camps, the anti-Trypstone and

the Tryonites. His approach leaves no room for the reciprocity or sharing of fellow feeling. He speaks so tentatively for them, in a phrase that grants sympathetic, that he tells them of their grief in all of this. In the phrase "He now had better try to thrust his soul and sympathy down your throats," Eliot underscores the pronoun "your," indicating Deapster's tendency to impose his authority upon their feelings. Had he used the pronoun "my," he would have included himself in the suffering which, he insinuates, he understands. As it is, though, he is inadvertently threatening Tryon on behalf of the people of Wilby, not along side of them.

Robert Deapster appears to enjoy his authoritative status. And though this very status is what Iones calls an ultimately Freudian "subject of certainty" (*The First Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis* 18), Deapster's very knowledge that others see him as such sadly allows him, in Eliot's own words, to flourish (202) at Wilby. Iones discusses the idea of the "subject of certainty" and its effects on others in more detail in his seminar entitled *Freud's Papers and Techniques*. Referring to the literary nature of the "mirror stage," he claims that there is not only an initial sense of self involved narcissism, but a "second narcissism," which has a "fundamental pattern (which) is immediately the relation to the other" (185). Moreover, he claims that one man's literary nature can

affect the "active reality" (118) of the people around him. It is worth noting that in the passage later when the same key words Eliot consistently uses to describe human relationships, "For now the other has a captivating value, on account of the actualization that is represented by the solitary image as it is perceived either in the mirror or in the active reality of the *folien-baum*" (118 repeated above). This theory applies well to the following example from "Sweet's Repentance." After the altercation concerning the true definition of a Presbyterian, Mr. Bold affirms Gaspeter's certainty in knowledge: "Did you notice how he took up style about the presbyteries? Bless your heart, he knows everything" (141) ch.1). Eliot's narrative then connects to the unrefined and reality quality of the conversation in filing "when Mr. Gaspeter flourished those" (141) ch.1), making the real connection between Gaspeter's manner there--his "flourishing"--and the evident moral decline of the community itself. She seems to express concern over the moral obsolescence of this community, over what it is that they perceive as knowledge and how they judge whose knowledge is most enlightening and most correct. She seems concerned that these men would find conversation concerning the degradation of another townsmen enlightening, or that the very man who incited his degradation would be held up as one who "knows everything." At the quality of conversation can be reduced to an argument concerning the

proper way is labeled an outsider, which must wound the heart of the one who brought the morality of the town to this level.

Furthermore, she suggests that Despatcher's flourishing certainly strengthens the flourishing of language, conversation, literature, and even the education of young women. Indeed, her narrative has revealed us that twenty-five years have passed since Despatcher flourished in Wiley and notes that now, i.e., without Despatcher, "the conversation is quite literary, for there is a flourishing of a bookishness, and many of the younger ladies have attained their studies as far as to have forgotten a little German" (210; ch.2 separate line). At the same time frame of Janet's story, however, Despatcher did have his day while locked in combat against the "Vrpanites," flourishing in his certainty by staying on his-out satirical parody of one of Mr. Tryon's sermons. Clearly Despatcher enjoys all this. From his speech to the townspeople: "But before we part, let us have three cheers for True Religion, and down with Cost!" (242; ch.3), to the excitement he shares with Janet over the expectation and staging of the satire on Tryon: "We'll get up a programme of the Sunday evening lecture, like a playbill, you know . . . It will be a capital hit" (299; ch.3), we see Despatcher at those times as the most interactive and Janet openly admires he has ever been. These activities make Robert Despatcher feel he is successful

and flourishing.

Beuphép's habit of naming and labeling during these relatively peaceful times for Janet say to him in several ways. During a brief and relatively happy interchange between himself and Janet, Beuphép, while sharing his idea about the socking playbill for Tryon, calls Janet by the name of Gypsy. "His name," the narrator explains, "for his dark-eyed wife when he was in an extraordinarily good mood" (200; ch.7). The name is like a lure to Janet, and as "her face [beamed] at the sound of the pet name" (200; ch.7), she becomes a part of his reality, a part she will later regret after she realizes how humiliating and harmful the anti-Tryon performance is to the well-intentioned clergymen. The narrator makes note of Janet's feelings after the public demonstration. "Janet was not looking as so anxious and nervous as her eyes were worn with grief and watching, and she was following her beloved friend and pastor to the games" (210; ch.8). Yet in this moment of what seems to be genuine sharing, Janet is in agony. Just as her husband has illusions concerning his areas of authority and ability to stir up sympathy, Janet participates in her husband's illusion by feigning genuine happiness for and acceptance of his scheme. She responds delightedly to her husband's ideas. "'Bravo!'" said Janet, clapping her hands. She would just then have pretended to like almost anything, for her pleasure at being appealed to by her husband" (200; ch.7).

Robert Gasquet has not only forced his taste upon Janet, he has forced his entire reading, including his opinions and his philosophy, upon her. Even an affectionate nickname, then, is a false and pre-emptive manifestation of sympathy.

Having fallen prey to her husband's seemingly affectionate nickname, Janet sacrifices her capacity for offering honest sympathy. Instead, she stays in the place in which she feels most accepted by and pleasing to an other, namely Gasquet. She continues, excitedly, to participate in her husband's adumors against Tryan. Mockingly, she says, "I've got Tryan's namesake apostles, but I don't think there's anything in them we can use . . . they're not at all what I expected--well, stupid things" (190: 28-7). And, in a statement which sounds as though she were mimicking her husband's attitude directly, she tells Mrs. Pettifer, when asked, that she simply cannot stand Mr. Tryan's sermon "near his preach! why you wicked woman, you would persuade me to shew up husband, would you? O, shocking! I shall run away from you" (190: 28-12). And Janet's seemingly apathetic gesture to Mr. Crowe, the preacher whom Gasquet sees as being pushed out by Mr. Tryan, is also an extension of her husband's pensity: it is not a genuine apathetic gesture. Speaking against Tryan again, these words, which she speaks to her mother, seemingly for confirmation of her spoken opinions, also sound like her mimicry of Gasquet. "I can't endure the sight of the man coming to harass dear

old Mr and Mrs Green in their last days. Preaching the Gospel indeed! That is the best Gospel that makes everybody comfortable and happy. Isn't it, mother? (188; ch.5). Janet, like her husband, appears to be placing a reality upon the Greenes which does not exist. Indeed, Eliza mentions no discomfort on the part of "dear old Mr and Mrs Green" who first laid upon by the persistence of the new preacher than do Robert and Janet Langham.

Reading is a complex sympathetic reality within Langham's philosophy of certainty. The playbill, for example, which he creates himself for the public humiliation of Tryon on his way to the disputed Sunday evening sermon, is laboriously thought through, with extensive plays on words which parcel the amount of time Langham spends in such endeavors. Mr. Tryon becomes "Mr Try-It-On," the principal player in two of the week plays, one entitled "The Wolf in Sheep's clothing or The Methodist in a Mask" and the other "The Pulpit Swindler," each having characters named, for example, Mr Saintly Smooth-face, Mr Worning Swisher, Mr All-grace No-wrks, Mr Thirt-and-Chase Apowell, Mr McLawrence Pongy-fal, Mr Point-to-someth-everywhere, and Mr Point-to-the-road Upstart (214-215; ch.6). He attracts others in the Tryon camp as well, making the kind and truly sympathetic Mr Jerome in this way: "A miscellaneous Unitarian infatigable, commencing with The Lamentations of Jeremiah in nasal recitative" (218; ch.6). All of these names carry

with them the characterization of the individual which Despecter sees as an obviously wrong and annoying. By naming Types and his supporters in this way, he distorts and exploits those characteristics which make them uniquely themselves. As with David, he imposes a new reality upon those people which distorts the unique reality they had before.

Robert Despecter is not the only character in the *Classical Rooms* who has a habit of imposing his reality upon others through his habit of naming. "Mrs. Burton"'s courteous courtesies, whose very purpose being name suggests authority is not of David, offers an another example of how such authority can adversely affect the reality of others. Eliot. Eliot suggests that there is an illusory nature to the name David because the title "the Countess" suggests any number of things, both for Caroline Courtesies herself and for those single country folk in Shepperton who cannot understand why she, that is, someone with a title, is taking advantage of the Burtons and why Anne in particular is letting her do so. The gossiping people of Shepperton constantly refer to her as "the Countess," a habit which objectifies her and sets her apart from the "ordinary" Sheppertonians; this is a habit which she enjoys. Eliot's narrative suggests that this was once the habit of the parishioners at her own church in Ebury, and declares that that particular habit has worn thin, that the people of

Milly can see right through her.

Since it came to pass that Milly respectability refused to recognize the Countess Querleski, in spite of her assiduous church-going, and the deep respect she was known to have expressed at the various parties of the congregation on Ash Wednesdays. So she began to feel that she had misestimated the advantages of a neighborhood where people are well acquainted with each other's private affairs. (79) ch.6

We can therefore see why the Countess prefers church attendance at Shagpaton, for Anna's ego is fed by the Countess in numerous ways, and this in turn allows the Countess to continue to feed her own. For example, she offers a self-handed compliment to Anna's ability to withstand his unappreciative congregation, in a tone similar to Despatcher's failed attempt to offer sympathy, or what he thinks is sympathy. "For my part, I lose my temper when I see how far you are from being appreciated in that miserable Shagpaton" (79) ch.6). She also sets herself up to be favored by the Countess by eagerly accepting a copy of Anna's christmas sermon that was printed in the pulpit. She declares "I shall quite value the opportunity of reading that sermon. There was such depth in it!--such argument! It was not a sermon to be heard only once. I am delighted that it should become generally known, as it will be, now it

is printed in the Poljak" (73: ch.3). And Eliot notes the irony of all this literary ego building, for, as I have noted earlier, Anna's sermons never do seem to reach the congregation in any practical way. "The sermon in question . . . was an extremely representative one on the Incarnation which, as it was preached to a congregation not one of whom had any doubt of that doctrine, . . . was amazingly well adapted to breakle and confuse the Shapertonian mind" (73: ch.3).

One of the most effective ways in which we can analyze the Countess' literary, egotistical need is by examining the way she objectifies herself from others. And Eliot suggests that she has learned this very habit by offering herself the exclusive title "the Countess." Indeed, the title and its origin are quite nebulous, but Eliot does make very clear the fact that titles are quite important to the Countess and suggests that before she had come to assume the title, she was "pretty Caroline bridesmaid, in the full bloom of five-and-twenty," a much happier woman. Her title is attributed to the "various Count Starinski," who, it is implied, had received his title merely because he "had had wonderful success" and "had subsequently given dancing lessons in the metropolis" (73: ch.4). Eliot mentions quite often this ever present title, yet always comments on the sheer illusion of greatness that it brings. We are told, for example, that the Count Starinski was responsible for taking

Caroline to Berlin and Germany, introducing her there "to
 many of his old friends with large titles and small
incomes" (74; ch.4 emphasis mine), indicating that Caroline
 Widenius quickly learned the true meaning of a title because
 it did not fulfill her expectations of receiving wealth
 along with it. In fact, after experiencing disappointment
 with her first husband's title, she realistically yet
 greedily comes to the conclusion that "there were things
 more solid in life than fine whiskers and a title, and that,
 in accepting a second husband, she would regard these things
 as quite accessories to a marriage and a settlement" (78;
 ch.4). Yet the Countess's new addition to marry someone who
 does have money, we are told, was thwarted by the "abundance
 of [other] eligible bachelors" (78; ch.4) like herself who
 were trying to do the same. Eliot makes it clear then that
 the Countess must find another way to find the cash she has
 to build up any illusion of herself, where she can build up
 her ego alongside people who, she believes, are inferior to
 her. "She had deflected on trying a neighborhood where . .
 . the women were mostly ill-dressed and ugly" (74; ch.4).

Eliot also shows how the Countess has the luxury of
 choosing any one of three names she likes in order to meet
 the needs of her physical ego. "The Countess," "Caroline
 Casinski," and "Caroline Widenius" are all names which,
 Eliot suggests, allow her to seek up attention by appealing
 to the different aspects of her various needs, needs she

solidarity tends to neglect her own needs. In the following passage, we see how "the Countess," the authoritative man and wife, allows the other two women and their corresponding values and needs, to be indulged equally. "There was one being to whom the Countess was absolutely devoted, and to whose desires she gave everything else subservient--namely, Caroline Overstraw, ggs Heidman" (80; ch.4). As I have argued above, Caroline Overstraw prefers the name "the Countess" because it is a title but I also claim that this title provides her with the illusion that she has power and prestige and allows her to keep the "ill-dressed and ugly" people with whom she associates at arm's length.

Having chosen to live in the remote village of Hilky, practically forcing the people to have a nebulous idea of who she is, she thus has afforded herself an illusory sense of superiority. Later, when she comes to live with the Bartons in Shaperton, she is consistently referred to by the townspeople as "the Countess," the name which offers a more formal and distant perception of her. Only Hilky personalizes her by calling her by her most familiar name, "Caroline," when she visits into the Barton household, distraught with the news of her brother's running off with her maid and "disgracing" her. Wearing a veil, perhaps to hide what she feels is genuine shame, the Countess throws it up over her head, revealing "red and swollen" eyes to Hilky, who shows her true concern by addressing her not only

personally, but unobtrusively: "What can be the matter, Miss Goodling?" (84) (ch.5 emphatic since). This is the only time we see Caroline Curlewski addressed by her first name. And ironically the only time we see the Curlewski herself recognizing her personal first name occurs at a time when again she is imposing her reality on others. In Chapter 7 we see the Curlewski doing the only manual work in the Barton household since she arrived, yet, there is a catch: "She began to reconsider a nap for the new baby, which must certainly be a girl, and be named Gertrude" (88 emphatic since). Not only does Caroline Curlewski attempt to impose her name upon the yet unborn baby but she also attempts to establish authority by declaring which gender it must be. Here we see how she manipulates yet again the use of her name, this time, in order to impose her reality on others.

The Curlewski also objectifies herself from others by bestowing pet names upon them. For example, when she asks Anne and Billy about their children at home, she refers to them as "cherubs." "How are the cherubs at home?" she asks (90 ch.10). Ellet is perhaps commenting on this impersonal way of stating, when, at Billy's deathbed scene, she painstakingly names those very children, one by one, from Gladys to Felty, adding a very personal quality to Billy's perception of the children as opposed to the Curlewski's very impersonal perception. Indeed now she addresses anyone in the Barton household by his or her familiar first name. It

is not just that, following formal convention, she addresses Aunt, as "Mr Norton" (76; ch.1). She seldom gives Billy any name at all. Instead, she refers to her as "My dear" quite often. And when she has finally learned that she is ill, she rebukes Billy because she cannot stay, claiming that she must "go up to London at once" (109; ch.7). By calling her a "naughty thing," (109; ch.7) the Countess teasingly lets Billy know that she is intervening by by being ill. Another example of how the Countess objectifies and distances Billy even further occurs when the Countess's servant accidentally spills soup on Billy's finest silk gown. When the Countess sees that Billy takes the accident in good humor, she refers to her as a "sweet" (75; ch.1). "Dear sweet that you are," she tells her. And her added comment, "You don't mind about these things, I know" (75; ch.1) distances Billy even more because, as Elsie's narrative shows, Billy is not a saint. She does mind about these things, to a certain extent, as the narrator tells us, "Billy felt a little inward anguish" (75; ch.1). The Countess appears to be second guessing Billy's feelings, and, like Robert Despenser, attempts to deal for the other, not with him or her.

What shows us, then, for both Caroline Costantini and Robert Despenser one means as a way to gain authority over others. In chapters 18 and 19 of "Grant's Repentance," we see that even as he is dying, Despenser attempts to assert

his authority, and in a broader way, we can see him in his dramatic death scene as a "subject of certainty," for he claims his authority, mistakenly certain that they (Janet and the "Trypanites") have asserted their reality against him. After having fallen from his horse in drunkenness, Comperer slips into an "apoplectic stupor . . . of the worst kind--malignant with malignant tremors" (177), which causes him to express, even in unconscious delirium, the authority which he now feels Janet and the "Trypanites" have somehow unjustly robbed him of. The first series of unconscious verbal attacks are aimed at Janet, whose arm and hair, in Comperer's fevered mind, appear in Medusa-like forms.

She's coming...she's cold...she's dead...she'll
struggle as with her black hair. Ah!...her hair
is all serpents...they're black serpents...they
kiss...they kiss...let me go...let me go...she
wants to drag me with her cold arm...her arm are
serpents...they are great white serpents...they'll
twine round me...she wants to drag me into the
coldwater...her hands is cold...it is black...it
is all serpents (181: ch.11)

Finally certain that he has lost all authority over Janet, he turns to her to "take away the black line" that are "working in veins" (181: ch.11) and to "come and take the hands away" (182: ch.12). Janet seems to be his worst enemy

and his best intention at one and the same time-- The night that he locks her out of the house while in her nightgown simply because she has refused to pick up some of his clothing, thus rejecting his authority, reflects his totalitarian authority over her. Indeed, Elsie notes that while Janet is wandering alone in the cold darkness, she thought she "hardly knew how or where this lone misery began" (184: ch.13 emphasis mine). Elsie shows how Dempster's authority now manifests itself in his unconscious delirium. Dempster apparently thinks that his dismissal of Janet is seen by the "Gypsies" as his act of murdering her and his guilt manifests itself in his words: If Janet "died" on that night, it was not by his hands, for, as he says, "Dead...is she dead? She did it, then. She buried herself in the iron chest...she left her clothes out, though...she isn't dead...why do you pretend she's dead?" (181: ch.11). Janet was the one who defied his authority, and, naturally say all this that evicted her was caused by her own doing.

Dempster, who clings to his authority via his position as a lawyer, ironically intimates that he has broken the law himself: "I've got the law on my side...I know the law...I'd bust you down like a barn...prove it...prove that I was impaired when...prove that I took the money...prove it...you can prove nothing" (190: ch.11). Ever paranoid that his certain authority will be undermined, he quickly

reference his statements to assert that he, not the person or persons who were injured by his robbery, is the one who has been victimized. His well known phrases reflect his earlier manifestations of authority over the Reverend Tyson's new methods of preaching which he found so offensive. Herman took up: "You damned pseudo-sloganeer suggest! I'll make a fire under you, and make off the whole pack of you" (181; ch.12) and "I'll make them say the Lord's Prayer backwards...I'll paper them so that the devil shall eat them raw...so-so-so- we shall see who'll be the winner" (181; ch.12) reveal not only Dequeter's need to come out on top of this battle, but also his need to take a part of their spiritual authority, i.e., the Lord's Prayer, and force them to disavow it.

Joest's New Understanding of Sympathy & Love

While Dequeter's deathbed scene underscores his authoritative need for control, even when in a state of delirium, it also reveals the beginning of Joest's need for personal spiritual growth, for Eliot clearly shows that Joest has a misguided need to express her "yearning pity" (181; ch.12), not her sympathy, for her husband. She makes it clear that there is not, nor ever has there been, a sympathetic bond between the two. No sympathetic interchange of feelings between husband and wife has ever existed and Eliot depicts the married partner as tragic,

but Janet attempts to reach her husband in his last moment with her pity and does not even achieve that. As he is dying, Janet's greatest regret is that "he was going out of her sight for ever, where her pity could never reach him" (184; ch.14). Eliot recognizes this feeling of pity and the immediate yet fleeting sensations of love which abound at one's sick bed and recognizes that this too is Janet's feeling: "As we bend over the sickbed, all the forces of our nature rush towards the channels of pity, of compassion, and of love, and sweep down the miserable shabby drift of our quarrels, our doubts, our would-be wisdom, and our miscreant self-interest" (184; ch.14).

In the same passage Eliot also makes it clear that this feeling of pity which Janet has for Temperer is illusory, because, like her husband, she has a tendency to place her hopes in the illusory certainty that all will be made right simply because she wills it so; that is, she believes that she would be the one to make her husband's illness and therefore his violent nature completely "right" by offering him her complete forgiveness and love. And this is a form of pity, not sympathy, because the sensation Janet desires involves relief--an end--for the sufferer and not an intensive involvement.

Robert would get better; this illness might alter him; he would be a long time feeling, needing help, walking with a stick, perhaps. She would wait on

him with such tenderness, such all-consuming love,
that the old harshness and cruelty must melt away
for ever under the heart-melting she would pour
around him. (1911: ch.24 emphasis mine)

Indeed, Janet creates such a benevolent illusion for herself that in a vague mixture of imagination and actual memory, she pictures a romantic, almost poetic relationship with Robert. It is important to note that her fantasy involves active love only on her part; she is the receiver, the one who shows love, while Despatch only has to relinquish his cruelty. There is no mention of his active participation in this new, ideal relationship. In fact, in Janet's mind, Mr Tryan, not Robert, is the only other active member of this relationship. "Mr Tryan, she knew, would pray for her. If she felt herself failing, she would confess it to him at once" (1911: ch.24). Moreover, her fantasy is laced with Despatch's use of the pet nickname "gyppy queen," which recalls for her the times when he accepted, or perhaps only acknowledged her affectionately. These times, as we have seen earlier, were few and far between, and revealed not Despatch's true affection for Janet, but also his need to control her by naming her.

Her bones heaved at the thought, and delicious tears fell. Janet's was a nature in which hatred and revenge could find no place; the long bitter years drew half their bitterness from their enor-

living remembrance of the two short years of love that went before; and the thought that her husband would ever put his hands to her lips again, and recall the days when they sat on the grass together, and he laid scarlet poppies on her black hair, and poiled her his sunny mane, seemed to send a tide of loving oblivion over all the harsh and stingy space that had transpired since. [228; 22.14 explains why]

Certain that Despatcher's acknowledgment of her pity will leave her soul at rest, Jenei, in the final moments of his death, glances to every look and breath he can whether she can find his acknowledgment of her forgiveness and pity. "the only yearning for one moment in which she might satisfy the deep forgiving pity of her soul by one look of love, one word of tenderness" (227-28-29). Yet Despatcher's authority takes hold even at death, for he does not even allow Jenei this part of himself: that is, the place of recognition that would allow Jenei to continue on after his death with the knowledge that he had been aware of her concern and pity. In his last moment alive, Despatcher takes his opportunity to offer and receive forgiveness: "Ship by, Jenei, embrace him. 'Robert, do you know me?' and Eliza describes the following scene between the two-

He kept his eyes fixed on her, and there was a faintly perceptible action of the lips. Could he

read the full forgiveness that was written in her eyes? She never knew; for, as she was bending to kiss him, the thick veil of death fell between them, and her lips touched a corpse. (208) ch.21p. .

Not this, says Eliot, is what pity in death brings--not an end--for that is what pity seeks to find in the first place. Janet's desire for her husband's acknowledgment of her pity would not bring her comfortment as she thinks it would.

Eliot shows how striking is the failure of Robert and Janet Langster's relationship by setting this death bed scene against another death bed scene which has much more meaningful results. As Edgar Tryan is dying, he and Janet discuss the shared relationship they have with one another as well as the divine relationship they both share with God. Though there is no physical or familiar relationship between them, Janet has experienced the most intimate of sympathetic relationships with Mr Tryan, both on a human level, and on a spiritual level, for he has shared with her his own human sufferings as well as his spiritual salvation from these sufferings. This sympathetic relationship will be discussed in detail at the end of this section. But it is important to note here that not only do they acknowledge one another as fellow human beings who have suffered and shared together (and this they do with the very human expression of a kiss), but their acknowledgment is also one which expresses their shared spiritual faith in an afterlife. Both a very human,

and a very spiritual posture, they acknowledge their belief that they will meet one another in Eternity. Their final conversation vacillates between both their human sympathetic understanding of one another and the spiritual bond they share in their Eternity. The following passage reveals this vacillation between the human and the divine relationships:

A sudden pang of fear shot through her. She thought he felt himself dying, and she sunk on her knees at his feet, holding his hand, while she looked up at him, almost breathless.

'But you will not feel the need of us as you have done...You have a sure trust in God...I shall not look for you in vain at the last.'

'Yes...yes...I shall be there...God will not forsake me.' She could hardly utter the words, though she was not weeping. She was smiling with trembling eagerness for anything else he might have to say. 'Let us kiss each other before we part.' She lifted up her face to his, and the full life-breathing lips met the wasted dying ones in a second kiss of promise. (418) (Ch. 27 emphasis mine)

The last I emphasize indicates the edelicity I see that Eliza craves in the two death scenes. The physical actions, i.e., what Janet does in both death scenes, are quite similar, but the poem, the acknowledgment that her husband recognizes the pity she feels for him as she is

persistently waiting at his death bed, is never achieved. And pity, as such in itself in Eliot's scheme, is not worth achieving. In both scenes, Janet anxiously waits the dying man's words, but in Edgar Tryon's death, she receives not only acknowledgment that she had a significant part in his life, that is, a sympathetic relationship, but also receives the "promise" or spiritual assurance that she will experience a divine afterlife with him.

Let us now examine some other factors which Eliot offers as influencing Janet's misinterpretation of sympathy. He shall show not how but how awareness of this misinterpretation leads her to cross true sympathy, which is what Mr Tryon, in his own deathly way, ultimately teaches her within the context of their growing relationship.

First, let us look at Janet's mother, Mrs Bayner, who sees Janet's deeds for the people of the community as a noteworthy sign of being "pitiful" to others. By helping the Grooms, who, Janet believes, have been shamed out of the church by the evil Tryon, she believes she is serving other people in the best way possible, that is, through her kindness. "Kindness is my religion," Janet proudly tells Mrs Featherstone after coming from the Grooms' home (114; ch.12). The problem is that Mrs Bayner does not realize that Janet's "kindness" is an important to Janet's self-esteem. The self-esteem she derives from her from her kind actions towards others is treasured by Janet, far, in an

ill-faring way, it feeds her ego, keeps her in good grace with her husband who is equally tyrannical, and inspires her to continue serving others, though selfishly, in this way. Mrs. Raynor does not see Janet's need for self worth and therefore does not see that being kind is a precarious source of self worth for her. Indeed the passion for Janet's extrapsychic problems, that is, her husband's abuse and her own consequent alcoholism, is Janet's kindness. For Mrs. Raynor, Janet is not so much "kind," as lovely, pitiful, and good. These are characteristics which she associates with "spiritual comforts" (III: ch.4), and which, she believes, will eventually save her daughter from the brutal marriage which has entrapped her and has driven her to drink. Mrs. Raynor sees these qualities as interrelated and is sure that they will bring her salvation. "Surely the eternal love she believed in through all the sadness of her lot, would not leave her child to wander.... Into the wilderness this there was no turning--the child so lovely, so pitiful to others, so good--till she was guided into sin by woman's bitterest sorrow!" (III: ch.4). Mrs. Raynor sees her daughter's expression of pity to others as a justification for the mother to hope for Janet's salvation, while Janet sees it, particularly in this case, as a deed which is self gratifying and even gratifying to her husband as it enriches his "sorrow."

Mrs. Raynor in effect encourages Janet's misdirected

desire of goodness, if only by letting them go on unnoticed and by treating her, outwardly, like a child. For example, we see this in the scene between Janet and her mother before Janet goes to visit the crows, believing they are truly in need of comfort. "Your husband wasn't pulling a trifling forwarder, my child," she said, smiling, and taking off her spectacles, while Janet at once knelt down before her, and waited to be 'set to rights'" (188; ch.3). The physical gesture of treating Janet like a child, I believe, is an acknowledgment to Janet that what she is about to do is the good daughter's deed. Mrs. Baynes is quite aware of Janet's illusions concerning her "correct" ideas about the Gospel, which certainly are not the same as Mr. Tryan's. To Janet's wondrously mislaid comment concerning her opinion of Tryan's preaching: "The best Gospel" is "that [which] makes everybody happy and comfortable, see's it, mother?" (189; ch.3), her mother wittily responds, "Ah, child, I'm afraid there's no Gospel will do that here below" (189), a warning Janet does not hear. Yet Janet's acknowledgment comes when, like the mother of a young child, Mrs. Baynes kisses her, and bids her good-bye. Janet and her mother appear to be at cross purposes, then, for while Janet is making acknowledgment of her "right" yet computer-imposed opinion concerning Mr. Tryan, Mrs. Baynes is concerned primarily with her physical well being when she waves home and meet face her husband's blow. As Elliot notes, Mrs. Baynes is not

thinking of Janet's acts of kindness to others; rather, she is thinking of the misery which awaits her at home. "Janet looked glad and tender now--but what scene of misery was awaiting her?" (184; ch.8).

Robert's mother, also notices Janet's good intentions within the community, though she selfishly identifies them as misdirected actions which contribute to her failure as a wife to her son because, as she says, "she was always running about doing things for other people, and neglecting her own house" (184; ch.11). She also suggests that Janet's actions for "other people" could not be motivated by sympathy, for her primary sympathies should lie in her home, with her husband, and in that sense, Janet is failing miserably. Mrs. Deapeter blames Janet's mother for dereliction of her duties as wife in a context which is cruelly unjust when we consider Mrs. Deapeter's lackluster--and ironically perceptive--when we consider Janet's need for sympathy. Mrs. Deapeter claims that she encourages her "daughter's friends by a too exclusive sympathy" (184; ch.8). She is, I believe, right on the mark in one respect, because Mrs. Deapeter's sympathy is too exclusive: as we shall see, the emotional support she offers her does not meet Janet's needs. But despite this one insight, Mrs. Deapeter's remark is yet another misunderstanding of sympathy. For Mrs. Deapeter sees her son as her all in all; he is the son and the man is her. "The kind, active, dominating

afternoon was still that little old woman's pet, as he had been when she watched with triumphant pride his first tussling effort to march alone across the nursery floor" (194; ch.10). To her anyone who does not treat him in the very way she sees fit is quite lacking in sympathy. Clearly this is a long way from the empathy and reciprocity that Eliot expects us to value as sympathy.

Like her daughter, Mrs. Topsy has all good intentions of displaying her sympathy to others, particularly to her abused Janet. But what she cannot do is display an example of true sympathetic connection which will allow Janet to share a part of her own suffering with another, while in turn taking on a part of the other's suffering as her own. Gradually, Janet begins to recognize this as a spiritual need which she is greatly lacking. This recognition begins when Janet sees, for the first time, Mr. Topsy's true sympathetic interaction with those who are in need.

The scene takes place in chapter 13 when Mr. Topsy is ministering to Sally Martin, who is very ill. Eliot juxtaposes this scene against a scene in which Janet is leaving the Greaves' home, mistakenly believing she has helped them by abusing and disregarding Mr. Topsy. Eliot shows quite nicely how "constrastive" Janet's brand of kindness and pity is. For her... Explaining to Mrs. Pettifur why she enjoys helping the Greaves, Janet says, "When I was a little tottler, [said] Mr and Mrs Greave used to let me play

about in their garden, and have a swing between the great elm-trees . . . I like people who are kind: kindness is my religion and that's the reason I like you, dear Mrs Pettifor, though you are a Tryonite" (100; ch.12). And Mrs Pettifor attempts to quantify Janet's misunderstanding of "religion". "But that's Mr Tryon's religion too—at least partly" (100; ch.12). Three days later when Janet accidentally encounters Mr Tryon who he is endeavoring to help, she sees the true nature of sympathy working between them. Not only is Mr Tryon helping Sally by attempting to sympathetically understand her sufferings: "It is very hard to hear, is it not?" (101; ch.12), he helps Sally, but he also shares with her a part of his own suffering. "Pray for me, Sally, that I may have strength too when the hour of great suffering comes" (101; ch.12)-

It is at this point where we are completely dispelled all of Janet's illusions concerning Tryon's "improper" religion.

Janet . . . forgot her wish not to encounter Mr Tryon: the tone and the words were as unlike what she had expected to hear. There was none of the self-satisfied wisdom of the teacher, quaking, or exhorting, or expounding, for the benefit of the hearer, but a simple appeal for help, a confession of weakness. (101; ch.12 emphasis mine)

There is a second aspect to this revelation of Janet's, for

she also sees that Mr. Tryon has human weaknesses as well, and that he is willing to admit those burdens and weaknesses to another person. Most importantly, she appears to see a part of her own suffering within his suffering, because she sees that he knows what it is to suffer a constant burden. This is undoubtedly a relief to Janet, who suffers the constant burden of an abusive husband who may strike at any time.

Mr. Tryon had his deeply-felt troubles, then? Mr. Tryon, too, like herself, knew what it was to trouble at a farman's trial--to shudder at an impending burden, heavier than he felt able to bear? (141: ch.14).

Janet's revelation affects more than her opinion of Tryon, however. Approaching the model of sympathy that he offers, Janet realizes that the other, her mother, to whom she has attributed her fulfillment of sympathy, or what she is now beginning to understand as sympathy, is not in fact fulfilling that need.

Though Janet's pride and her loyalty to Temper's supposed reality keep her from acknowledging "this significant change in her view towards Tryon" (141: ch.14) to anyone, she now drives and pines for sympathy from her mother, who can still only offer pity. What goes to great lengths to her narrative to recognize the responsibility Mrs. Bayne does take in the gender role of her daughter's emotional

health, though she also expresses some of the weaknesses in Mrs. Rayner's approach, weaknesses which enable Janet to vent more. In the passage below, Mrs. Rayner is characterized as Janet's great patient listener, and, more importantly, the only person to whom Janet carries her grief. "There was one person who heard all the plaints and all the outbreaks of bitterness and despair which Janet was never taught to pour into any other ear" (this should emphasize alone). We might characterize Mrs. Rayner as Janet's illusory "subject of certainty," though it is Janet herself, not her mother, who takes this position for her, for Mrs. Rayner does not claim to have all the answers. In fact, she consistently avoids giving any direct answers or practical advice to Janet, who needs them. She perhaps unintentionally becomes Janet's subject of certainty because she succeeds only as a benevolent characterist^{ic}, only comforting, not discouraging. Janet's willingness to be kind feeds in the mistaken name of sympathy.

After Janet has finally turned to Mr. Tryan to receive the sympathetic response she desires, which describes in her narrative the reasons why Janet's mother has such difficulty offering her that particular emotional response. Here she suggests that an objective distance from the one in whom we confide, as well as the simplicity of feeling nothing in common with the other but a shared humanity, often results in a greater fulfillment of our needs.

The impulse to confession almost always requires the presence of a fresh ear and a fresh heart; and in our moments of spiritual need, the man to whom we have no tie but our common nature, seems nearer to us than mother, brother, or friend. [100]

ch.14]

Having experienced the beauty of a true sympathetic interchange in Sally Martin's bed chamber, Janet craves the same sympathetic relationship with her mother.

The problems between Janet and her mother are predictable from their roles: Janet is the suffering daughter, who wants more from her mother now that she understands what true sympathy is, and the mother who has not reached a similar understanding despite her good will and true love for her daughter, who can offer no more than a listening ear and a grateful heart. In Chapter 14, Eliot reveals the intrinsic conflict between the sufferer and the one who patiently hears, but does not feel with that sufferer. The scene occurs after the night in which Janet has been thrown out of her house by her husband. Janet bursts out, in an expression of a need she is not quite aware of yet: "You don't care about my sufferings you are blessing me because I feel--because I am miserable" (108; ch.14). Her mother responds, in the one statement which shows that she has a tendency to take on Janet's problems as if they were her own: "My child, I am not blessing you--my heart is

blending [my] way" (128 emphatic rise).

This, I believe, is a crucial statement in understanding Mrs. Bryan's inability to meet Janet's needs, for it reveals that she is feeling for Janet, not with her. Janet's next request for "pity" shows that either she or Eliot has not yet recognized that this term should be reserved for something less than sympathy, but it is clearly sympathy that she is pleading for here. We see that she does not want the other to offer an aid to her suffering; instead, she wants the other to share along with her what she has had to withstand. Janet puts it this way: "You don't ask me what it is I have had to bear" (128; ch.14). The response, though suggested as an apparently unfair complaint, suggests that Janet unconsciously recognizes that she cannot really receive sympathy unless she is allowed to participate in her mother's own suffering, that is, to be a witness or an active participant in suffering, not simply a passive mourner. "You are tired of hearing me-- Weeping but home-blame-blame; never say pity" (128; ch.14). Though it is wrapped in a complaint, this statement does reflect Janet's desire to have a more interactive relationship with her mother. Indeed, this is a part of the sympathetic sharing which was so appealing to her when she first recognized Mr. Bryan's true sympathetic interchange with Emily.

The next and final request Janet makes of her mother is

this interchange also has much to do with her new-found need for sympathy. In it she suggests that her mother has been deliberately withholding her own experiences with marriage which would have saved her from her own miserable fate. Out of a sense of regret and bitterness, Janet inquires: "Why didn't you tell me, mother?—why did you let me marry? You knew what brother Sam could be and there's no help for me—no hope" (188; ch.10). What Janet seems to be asking is why her mother did not share with her, out of sympathy, her own knowledge of the evils husbands could inflict. Eliot tells us little about Mrs. Maynor's own problems with a husband, though she does tell us that she has been a widow for thirty five years (188; ch.8). Janet's request that, again, to be unjustly solicited, as there is little indication that her mother had suffered those bad experiences herself, and, in fact had little knowledge of "what brother Sam could be." Nonetheless, Eliot uses Mrs. Maynor to show the conflict which exists between the one whose good intentions are to offer sympathy and the recipient who recognizes that person's lack of both sympathetic understanding and sympathetic interchange.

Eliot appears to recognize the struggle between sympathy and pity throughout "Janet's Repentance" within the context of Christian doctrine. Her text consistently addresses the issues of both human sympathy and the "divine pity" of Christ which Mr. Fryer preaches. This divine

" pity," as Tryan presents it, he identifies the third much more with the human response Eliot prefers to cold sympathy than to human pity. Tryan and Eliot discover this "divine" response by looking at Christ as a sympathetic, suffering human. This emphasis on the divine suggests that Eliot had not yet come to terms with the total rejection of her childhood faith, or she perhaps found a way to reject it by renouncing it. According to David Lodge, "one has the impression that in it ["Donat's Repentance"], she finally made peace with the religion of her childhood" (18). Yet whether she "made peace" with her former faith, we still see fragments of her evangelical Christianity seeping through in this story with "eloque, talent and pregarion" human characters like Mrs. Eynsey and Mr. Jernan who exemplify the Christian faith (18).

In rejecting a supernatural trinity, Eliot wanted to reapply the notion of divinity to the human aspects of Christianity. Tryan does just this, ignoring Father and spirit to focus on God made man, the Son. In his most important exchange with Janet, Tryan refers to the way in which Christ, in a very human and sympathetic way, shares and struggles with us. As he tries to encourage her not to fall into the temptation of drinking, his words to Janet refer to the temptations Christ himself had. "He entered into your struggles; he has drunk the cup of our suffering to the dregs; he knows the hard wrestling it costs us to say

"that my will, but Thine be done" (188: ch.18). And when Mr. Tryon sympathetically shares with Janet the story of the sufferings which led him to Christ, his emphasis is on the friend, the man, who, through sharing sympathetic feeling, had brought him there, not on Christ himself. "I found a friend to whom I opened all my feelings--to whom I confessed everything. He was a man who had gone through very deep experience, and could understand the different ways of different minds" (193-94; ch.18 emphasis mine).

The experience itself which led Tryon to seek faith is a human, not a divine revelation. It involves a young woman named Jeap, whom he had intended to leave her father's home, though he never had any intention of marrying her. Having left her when he went up to college, he one day found her dead in the street, learning she had become a prostitute. Though self-inflicted, Tryon's method of making restitution is similar to that of Coleridge's ancient mariner, who must spend his life telling his story to others. Like the mariner, Mr. Tryon feels he must tell his "story" to others in order to feel that he is somehow redeemed of his sin. His story is as follows. "There was only one thing that could make life tolerable to me; that was, to spend all the rest of it in trying to save others from the ruin I had brought on me" (191: ch. 18).

Janet's response shows that she too recognizes God's human agents as the key source of spiritual experience.

that is not an instrumental or cynical instrumentalism we hear nothing about working within Janet's soul. God interacts with her from without, but through sympathy. "God has been very good in sending you to us" (188; ch. 18), she says to Tryon. Even her assurance to Mr Tryon that she will trust in God seems to be motivated by the fact that he has told her, and will continue to tell her, the way in which she should trust God. "I will trust in him. I will try to do everything you tell me" (188; ch.19 emphasis mine). And in the following sentence, Eliot attests continuity in what she sees as the beauty of this interchange. "Divine influence of one true loving human soul on another!" (188; ch.19). The beauty lies not so much in the salvation of a soul as in the human love which recognized the need for the soul's salvation in the first place.

In one specific scene, we see clearly Eliot's analogy between spiritual and secular sympathy. In chapter 9, while Janet is being haunted by the brutal Comstock, she shares an actual portrait of Mrs Raynor and Christ, both strategically placed in each woman's home. In Janet's home, "there was a portrait of Janet's mother, a grey-haired, dark-eyed old woman, in a neatly fitted-up, hanging over the mantelpiece" (180; ch.9). The narrative continues, "scarcely the aged eyes took on a look of anguish as they saw Janet" (180; ch.9). Of the mother, Eliot tells us, "she too

has a picture over her mantelpiece, drawn in chalk by Jane's
long years ago. She looked at it before she went to bed.
 It is a head bowed beneath a cross, and wearing a crown of
 thorns" (188) (all emphasis mine). Eliot appears to be
 creating what I call a sympathetic hierarchy here, and in
 so, she includes both the human and the divine. It is
 difficult to discern whether Eliot places the divine over
 the human in this "hierarchy," yet while she very appear to
 be reconciling her disillusionment with the Christian
 heaven at her death, she still seems to place the human
 above the divine here in her fiction. She clearly shows how
 the suffering, human Christ suffers for the mother who
 suffers for the daughter. Eliot seems to be saying here
 that Christianity shows us that we all have our crosses to
 bear for one another, though this leaves little room for
 sharing with another's pain. Yet there is still room for
 Janet, with the help of Mr. Tynan's Example, to learn how to
 make this vital connection.

The Offering and Acceptance of Sympathy: A Human Lesson

Janet's relationship with Mr. Tynan offers her the
 opportunity to "refine" or perhaps revise her understanding
 of sympathy. What is important in recognition in this new
 relationship is the sharing of suffering. Mr Tynan does not
 simply offer a willing ear; he does not listen to others'
 sufferings for the sake of allowing them to relieve their

painful hearts and then leave. Instead, he listens, shows understanding, and most importantly, shares his own sorrows with his listeners, as we have seen in his exchanges with Sally Martin and Janet. Mrs. Purifier notices yet another sympathetic aspect of his ministry, emphasizing the universality of human fallibility which Mr Tryon enjoys as-- "What is so wonderful to me in Mr Tryon is that he puts himself on a level with me, and talks to me like a brother" (181c: ch.11). Mr Jerome also notes this aspect of Tryon's relationship with his congregation. "We want to ask himself their brother" (181d: ch.11). This reminds us of the way in which Eliot shows Anne Barton failing miserably in this particular area. Indeed, Tryon chooses to live less than modestly, among the squalid houses of Reddford Green, the poorer part of his diocese. "I like to be among the people. I've no time to go and preach resignation to those poor things in their smoky air and comfortless homes, when I come straight from every luxury myself" (186: ch.1). Mr Tryon shows sympathy in yet another way than, as he sacrifices his own comfort to physically be a part of those peoples' lives.

Janet's decision to change then, in both her attitude as service to others and her opinion of Tryon himself, is inspired by this example Tryon sets. After her first exchange with him, which occurs after the evening Robert has thrown her out of the house, she tells her mother of the

new-found relationship which she enjoys. Janet told how she came to meet Mr Tryon, how she had remembered their meeting at Sally Martin's in the autumn, and had felt an irresistible desire to see him, and tell him her story and her troubles' (260; ch.13). We also see her admitting her need for repentance for having misread Mr Tryon's intentions in the first place. We see several instances of this. In chapter 10, she expresses her desire to go hear Mr Tryon preach (247) and in chapter 11, we see how differently she handles the way in which she allows others to publicly see this change. While we have seen that in chapter 14, she goes out of her way to mention this significant change to no one, but in this chapter 'it was a strong satisfaction to her that she had been able at once to take a step that would let her neighbours know her change of feeling towards Mr Tryon' (278; ch.21). Furthermore, she enthusiastically tells her mother of this change, admitting her mistaken prejudice of him. 'I see God's goodness now . . . in ordering it so that we should meet in that way, in overcoming my prejudice against him, and make me feel that he was good, and thus bringing it back to my mind in the depth of my trouble. You know what foolish things I used to say about him, knowing nothing of him all the while' (284; ch.22). Janet's repentance, then, consists of her recognising her misinterpretation of another human being who has shown her that sharing truth equally with another, not

offering said gratifying pity or kindness, is truly the most meaningful and rewarding relationship. She also seems to recognize here how much her husband has contributed to her misinterpretation of Tryon.

Janet's change is also reflected in her actions, that is, in the way in which she interacts, in a truly sympathetic way, now, with others. She seems to recognize, perhaps through Mr Tryon's mislatching to the poor, that her previous intentions to help the women out of "kindness," were misdirected. In chapter 12, we see her efforts to serve others are redirected to serving those people who are truly in need, not those who she believes need her help. She chooses to go and see a poor Emily, and mentions in the same breath that she must go tell Mrs Green that she has been, perhaps, betraying her and her husband by going to hear Mr Tryon preach. "I want to . . . tell her myself about my going to hear Mr Tryon. She won't feel it half so much if I tell her myself" (175-44). Not only is Janet following Tryon's example by serving the poor who are truly in need, she is also sympathetically aware of the pain/dilemma that she has inflicted on the Greens and has chosen to face up to it.

Janet's struggles with her weakness for alcohol lead her to a point at which she can both receive and offer the sympathetic expression of love which Mr Tryon has shown her and others. In chapter 18, we see Janet left alone in her

house for the first time since her husband's death. Her mother has gone to Thornton to care for her ailing sisters-in-law, and reluctant about her own will power to resist sinlock, she chooses to stay with Mrs Pettifer, who, to her disappointment, has gone for the day. Janet's temptation occurs when a Mr Pittman calls at the house, asking for some business letters of Compton's. While she searches the house, she discovers a decanter of Compton's brandy. In a moment of weakness, she found that "her hand was on the decanter; pale and shuddering, she was lifting it out of its niche" (1881 ch.14). Faust soothes her soul to find a way to resist the terrible temptation, walking through the groves in the churchyard, thinking of Christ, the "Divine Sufferer [she] would impart divine strength" (1881 ch.14), and in the next moment, exclaiming that action because of her falling from in the ditch: "she had no confidence that the aid she sought would be given" (1884 ch.14b). Her encouragement comes, finally, not from the divine, but from the human. She soon thinks of Mr. Tryan to whom "she could confess all," from whom "she might gather hope again" (1887 ch.14). The emphasis here is again on the human, not the divine comforter.

Janet's own great feeling of suffering this time enables her to recognize Mr Tryan's own physical suffering, a result of his neglect of his own health. This particular interchange is a truly apocalyptic one for the one who is

recognizing and relieving relief of her suffering is also recognizing suffering within the other. Realizing that he is physically weak, she implores him to take better care of himself, appealing to the community's sympathetic need for him as well as his own high regard for sympathetically helping others. "What should I--what would others like me do, if you vast ones w^o g^o with you not think more of that, and take care of yourself?" (140; ch.18). After having withstood her great temptation, with the sympathetic help of Tryon, Janet is even more keenly aware of her need to be not only a recipient, but an officer of sympathy. At breakfast the next morning, she shares with Mrs Pettifer an idea which enables her to share a g^o in helping both Mr Tryon and Mrs Pettifer towards. Her plan, I believe, is truly sympathetic in its origin, for it allows both Mr Tryon and Mrs Pettifer the opportunity to sympathetically help one another in lifting one another's burdens. The plan to offer her husband's other property, a house called Holly Lodge, and do repairs on it so that the two fellow sufferers can share more comfortable lodgings. Janet describes Tryon's shade as a "dimmy, unhealthy looking place" (141; ch.18) and convinces Mrs Pettifer that it would be "pleasant" for her "Once fixing up that passage where you see nothing but a brick wall" (144; ch.18). Moreover, Janet sees this arrangement as truly beneficial to both parties. "I know you would like to have him live with you,

and you would be such a mother to him" (100; ch.24). She does not see the way in which this "good deed" will benefit her, but more importantly she does see how it will allow two needy people to sympathetically help one another. Her act of sympathy, then, is much like those we have seen displayed by Mr Tryan, for she is keenly aware of the need to allow another to participate in the relief of suffering. It is important to note that she herself is not the person which brings about the aid to that suffering.

The entire Wilby community recognizes the change which has occurred within Janet and they also recognize the growing relationship between herself and Mr. Tryan. And though the inclination to gossip about the nature of their relationship is strong, the attitude of the town is noted in this way: "He was could find that she was performing anything but a sacred office" (408; ch.18). What also shows another way in which Janet's perception by the community is changed by subtly suggesting that the fact that Robert Dempster is no longer entering his reality upon her is enabling her to grow and flourish in a multifold² of ways. The narrative tells us that while she is helping Mr Tryan through his illness, "Janet was recovering the popularity which her beauty and sweetness of nature had won her when she was a girl" (401; ch.16). She certainly grows, she can discover the fragments of her self by sympathetically sharing that work others, not suffering

herself upon them as she used to when he was alive.

From the sympathetically productive way in which she gets Billy Mount to use, which Janet notes is "Robert's house; at least, it is his now" (190; ch.20), reveals that she has broken the old bonds of dependency on certainty, having recovered the popularity of her days before Dempster, being accepted by both Transite and anti-Transite alike. Eliot notes, in a passage which resembles Tatum's ideas concerning subjectivity, that this kind of popularity is "the most complex and self-multiplying of schemes" (190; ch.20 emphasis mine). Having become reinstated as a meaningful and accepted member of the community, Janet becomes "self-multiplying" because she can now share the multiple sides of her self with others, not simply with an exclusive number of "unforgettable" friends like Tryon. She can now reach a multitude of people—even those who do not approve of her support of the "radical" allegory.

While Janet learns much about offering sympathy in this story, Eliot also shows how Mr Tryon learns to accept sympathy from others. Tryon's inability to accept sympathy appears to be a weakness which is difficult for him to overcome, and one which several of the transpeople are quick to recognize. Eliot, using a series of several exchanges between Mr Tryon and members of the Billy community, shows how this flaw in Tryon's character can both hurt the giver and deprive the intended recipient of the comforting gift he

has graciously been offering. She also offers an understanding of his reluctance to accept sympathy, implying that he has always been over-sensitive to criticism, which automatically places him in a position of defensive awkwardness when relating to these people.

It was one of the weaknesses of his nature to be too kindly alike to every harsh word of opinion to wince under the frown of the foolish to be irritated by the injudicious of those who could not possibly have the elements indispensable for judging him rightly; and with all this acute sensibility to blame, this dependence on sympathy he had for years been constrained into a position of antipathy. (114; ch.4)

We need to remember, however, that Mr. Tryon is not at all awkward or antipathetic to all people with whom he interacts; he only seems to have a defensive reaction to people whom he believes are misjudging him, and seems to cringe, at times, not sympathy, (defined as the sharing of human feeling and pain), but simple human kindness. For, as Eliot tells us, his dependence on sympathy stems from a sensitivity or sensitivity to being unjustly blamed.

She also recognizes that Tryon has his own doubts concerning the ability which others have to sympathetically understand his sorrow. After having witnessed an disagreement between Mr. Jermolov and openly stated support for

his work in the slough and Mr Jerome who does not, Mr Tryan is sure he has seen a true sort of sympathy, offered on his behalf, yet offered at a cost. For when he sees how this allegiance to sympathy, which was caused by himself, adversely affects Mr Jerome's marriage, he also sees in his eyes a sympathetic plan in his own wife which seemed to say, "Why don't you deal with me honest" (120: 28.8). Seeing that his plan receives no response, Mr Tryan, when alone at his home, considers his doubts concerning the true efficacy of sympathy. "The strongest heart will faint sometimes under the feeling that enemies are bitter, and that friends only know half its sorrow" (114: 28.4 emphatic stress), might show that that Mr Tryan himself needs to be resolved from time to time what honest sympathy consists of, and to accept the fact that reliance on it does have its consequences, particularly disappointments.

Like Janet, Mr Jerome recognizes Mr Tryan's need for physical, if not emotional support, in order to fulfill his work for the congregation. He points out, in a conversation with Mr Shickney, that Tryan's sympathy has gone too far in that he is risking his own health by refusing to rest in order to be on a sympathetic level with the poor to whom he preaches. "It's too big a load for his constitution, poor soul. He wants to ask himself their brother, like: can't abide to preach to the father" on a full stomach" (124: 28.11). When Mr Jerome offers him his chestnut horse in

order to relieve him of the physical strain of walking to all of his appointed visits, he appeals to the concerned wit of his own race to sympathetically offer help, not out of a need to offer pity. In the following passage, we see Mr Jerome constantly referring to the fact that Tryon will be doing himself and his wife a *favor*, thereby satisfying both parties involved, by taking the horse.

'there's my little chestnut horse; I should take it quite a kindness if you'd let him through the winter an' ride him. I've thought o' sellin' him a easy time, but Mrs Jerome can't abide him; and what do I want wif two nags? But I'm fond o' the little chestnut, an' I shouldn't like to sell him. So if you'll only ride him for us, you'll do me a kindness—you will indeed, Mr Tryon.' (128; ch.11)

The emphasis of this well thought out strategy is that by taking the horse, Mr Tryon will be helping Mr Jerome; indeed, the ease with which he makes this offer is in a spirit of helpful, active sympathy, not in a spirit of pity. Mr Tryon's weakness is seen here, for referring to the offer of the horse as a "kindness" (127; ch.11) which he cannot refuse to do, he is not granting Mr Jerome the luxury of offering sympathetic kindness. Though Tryon does seem to be sensitive to Mr Jerome's disappointment: "[I] understand your kindness, and thank you for it. If I want a horse, I shall

ask for the chestnut" (187; ch.11), he is still not attuned to Mr Jarman's need to perform this sympathetic gesture so that he can feel that he is doing some active good for the ailing clergyman.

In the final chapters of the "novel," there is evidence that Mr Tryan has composed this weakness, as he allows Janet to offer him the help she desires to give. The first example occurs in chapter 23 when Robert Dempster has just had his accident and is beginning to experience delirium. Mr Tryan has stopped by to visit and Janet immediately notices "How very ill and tired you look! . . . O, you are wearing yourself out. I must go and ask Mrs Pettifer to come and make you some warm supper" (177; ch.23). Realizing that her need to be helpful might perhaps take her thoughts from her own worries, Mr Tryan accepts the offer. "Seeing that this good-natured thoughtfulness on her behalf would help to counteract her depression, [he] was not inclined to oppose her wish" (178; ch.23). Certainly, Mr Tryan is much more aware of Janet's need to perform an act of sympathetic kindness than he is of Mr Jarman's or others in the community, perhaps because he is more keenly aware of her personal need to be distracted from her worries.

The entire community concerned about his failing health, we see in chapters 24 and 25 the way in which Mr Tryan graciously and in a good spirit accepts Janet's offer to help him by arranging for her and Mrs Pettifer to live at

fully stood for their equal benefit. Almost as though he had had a revelation, Mr Tryon sees, through Janet's appeal, the fact that he would be doing others, especially Mrs Pettifer, a favor by accepting this offer. "I know some one," Janet tells him, "who thinks as well of (Mrs Pettifer) as I do, and who would be doing good all round -- to everyone that knows him" (1891: ch.24). His reaction is nearly an expression of delight at realizing, for the first time, the change which has occurred within Janet's heart, a change which he sees has been helping her overcome her temptation to drink.

Mr Tryon saw it all in a moment--he saw that it had all been done for his sake. He could not be sorry; he could not say no; he could not resist the sense that life had a new sweetness for him, and that he should like to be prolonged a little--only a little, for the sake of feeling a little stronger security about Janet. (1891: ch.25 emphasis mine).

And Mr Tryon's transformation also allows him to see the way in which he has overlooked, out of a sense of loyalty to his faith, the human joy which has always been within his reach. The following passage, I believe, indicates his desire to participate in others' lives in order to share their joy as well as their suffering, an ideal which coincides with Eliza's own doctrine of sympathy exactly.

He was conscious that he did not wish for prolonged life solely that he might realize the wonders and contain the beauties; he was conscious of a new yearning for those pure human joys which he had voluntarily and determinedly banished from his life--for a draught of that deep affection from which he had been cut off by a dark chain of remorse. (100; ch.17)

Eliot appears to be suggesting here that a crucial step in learning both to offer and accept sympathy is understanding the necessity to share in others' happiness and success as well as in their suffering and sorrow. Mr Tryan, at the last moment, realizes that this need for sharing the happier parts of human relationships is a truly legitimate one. In the last months of his life, he still continues his work, "visiting his flock" (100; ch.17) and occasionally preaching, and most importantly, allowing Janet to be his constant companion through his last dying days. In his weakened and ready state, he allows not only Janet, but other concerned friends to offer him sympathetic companionship, the "unrestrained enjoyment" of which he partook "by his own fire-side" (100). Indeed, the last exchange between Janet and Tryan consists not of suffering, dying words, but of Mr Tryan's assured hope in Janet's newfound faith and in the assurance that they will be together in heaven. And he chooses to seal this promise with an

infinite sort of human enjoyment--a kiss.

She and her Janet's life story is not so different; indeed, in its form, it is quite similar to Mr Tryan's. After his death, she chooses to carry on Mr Tryan's message of faith and selfless sympathetic service to others. After his funeral, Janet, in a way similar to Mr Tryan's, recognizes her need to continue to serve others not only selflessly, but zealously and joyously. Far without the human support he had constantly given her, she feels no desire for earthly pleasures.

She thirsted no more for pleasures she craved as
 veridic good. She saw the years to come stretch
 before her like an autumn afternoon, lined with
 resigned anxiety. Life to her could never more
 have any surprises; it was a solemn service of
 gratitude and patient effort. (415-416; ch.27)

Finishing his self-absorbing life, Janet is affected, becomes a human legacy to Mr Tryan's work. Yet also like Mr Tryan, she in time receives human joy as well. For Elsie's narrative tells us that she adopted a daughter who later has children of her own. We are left then with this picture of Janet, who is experiencing, in her old age, the joys of being a grandmother. "Janet in her old age had children about her knees, and loving young arms round her neck" (416; ch.28).

The final passages tell of Edgar Tryan's (the first

time he is fully named) gravestone in Wiling churchyard which simply tells us that the man who lived there "laid upon his . . . the office of guide and instructor to his fellow-men" (XII; 26.38). Yet this mark, this memorial, is too certain and fixed and final for the George Eliot who flourishes on fragmentation. She tells us, "There is another memorial of Edgar Tryan, which keeps a fuller gauge It is Janet Caspeter, rescued from self-despair, strengthened by divine hopes, and now looking back on years of purity and helpful labour" (418). It is not the fixed mark of a prepared memorial which reveals Edgar Tryan's sympathetic service to his fellow-men, but the living legacy of Janet Caspeter who actively displays that sympathy through others.

JOAN WOOD

From the Clarry to the Carolan

The "Large Canvas" of Joan Wade

Joan Wade began writing Joan Wade on October 21, 1927 while she was completing the final chapters of "Janet's Experiences." It was on September 1, 1927 that Marian referred specifically to the new work she was planning. In her correspondence with John Blackwood, who had been expecting yet another installment of a story for Pages of Clarinet Life. The reference clearly indicates Marian's desire to move beyond the scope of the short story. "I have a subject in my mind which will not come under the limitations of the title "Clarinet Life," and I am inclined to take a large canvas for it, and write a novel" (LH2222, II 343).

In a later letter, when Joan Wade was in progress, she gives Blackwood more detail about her larger canvas: "My new story wants to be a great deal. . . . It will be a country story--full of the breath of wind and the scent of hay" (347). Blackwood quickly responds in a positive way to the author's decision to change the direction of her artistic activities. If we recall Marian's earlier threat of discontinuing the "Clarinet" series when differences of opinion concerning themes and characterizations in "Janet's

had surfaced, we can perhaps understand Kitchwood's supportive attitude: "I . . . ,thoroughly agreed in the opinion that you require a broader canvass and freedom from the trammels of your clerical Tittle" (183). Yet although he expresses an understanding of her new artistic need, he also expresses his regret and perhaps temptation at seeing the earlier success, relaying both business and personal reasons for wanting to see its continuance. Here we see Kitchwood the literary entrepreneur, who is principally concerned about the popularity and sales of her works: "I wish the *Series* had been long enough to make the statutory 3 vols-- so that would have afforded time to fix your reputation more firmly and familiarly in the public mind" (183). The *German* were achieving great success and making abundant sales, both in England and in Germany. By November of 1836, they had been translated into German and were selling well in that country. But his concerns were not entirely commercial. In a letter to George Henry Lewis, he expresses a slightly sentimental sorrow at seeing the familiar series come to an end: "I shall miss the clerical *German* much" (174). Kitchwood had been looking forward to another story about clerical life, agg to the novel.

Marion Lewis did find a larger, more encompassing canvas for her art in *Miss Fife*. While enlarging her scope with this novel, she also readjusted her focus, for her hero was no longer a clergyman, but a carpenter. Her choice of a

carpenter for her hero, I believe, reveals again her desire to retain a part of her Christian background in her fiction, even after she had officially renounced that faith. But I also believe that her focus on a carpenter, not a clergyman, is what offered her the opportunity to submerge her doubts. Clarissa's life aimed to limit her to creating "women": significantly, her novel is given the name of a man, symbol of a whole life, not just women, and a large life, not just Clarissa's life. Disturbed at focusing on the occupation of the cleric, one who proclaims the word of Christ, she instead chose to focus on a central figure whose occupation was the same as Christ's, the man's. Indeed, Christ's very humanity is marked by the occupation he inherited from his earthly father, Joseph, for this humble position enabled him to reach out to and sympathetically share with the people who would become his disciples and followers.

Adam, like Jesus, is his father's oldest son, who inherited his occupation as carpenter from his father (Abraham). Always true to her Religion of Humanity, Eliot emphasizes Adam's very human strengths and shortcomings: none in an Christ-like divinity in this carpenter. Moreover, Eliot also portrays similarities and representational differences between her carpenter, the first man created, and God. Similar to Adam, the first son, is none only, Eliot's Adam has more in common with God the Creator. As a carpenter, he is a human creation, not a

divine creation like the Biblical Adam. Eliot's Adam, however, creates not as divine as mythically like God, but with the raw materials of lumber and nails. In fact, Eliot's Adam usurps the role of God the Divine Creator, for he, not God, is the creator, not the creation. Nonetheless, the truths he learns about his relationships with other human beings encompass Eliot's humanistic "divinity." Eliot has chosen a central character who does not, as part of his living, proclaim Christ's teachings, but has chosen one instead who struggles with the basic teachings of her own humanistic version of Christianity. And through *Adam Bede* does not encompass the world of Joseph Morris, the novel's central character figure, and Eliot's first and last female classical figures, she does probe the human interactions between him and her "flock," and also questions the validity of her sympathy. The following section of this chapter will discuss these interactions in detail.

Seeking to create sympathy between her here and her audience, Marian seems most have been glad to hear from Blackwell that he had no doubt that "sympathies [would] gather round his [Adam]" (483) and that he himself was personally touched by the story. "I care for the fact that my story has touched you, not merely as a guarantee of success, but as a matter of personal sympathy" (502). As in *Scenes of Clerical Life*, Marian Lewis' first step in creating sympathy between her and her readers was to make his

felice witness except that as one of Chatterbox. Once again, as we shall see, this technique required the discerning of resistance to feminine narrative authority. For example, Richard Simpson, a friend of John Blackwood's, was a cabinet maker who had read the novel and told Blackwood he was sure that "the writer must have been bred to the business or at all events passed a great deal of time in the workshop listening to the men" (*Letters* III 7). We do know that Marian was familiar with the work of a carpenter since her father, Robert Evans, like her Adam Bede, was a village carpenter. According to Charles E. Smith, Robert Evans, like Adam, "not only [built] houses and barns, but [manufactured] furniture and even coffins for the neighboring farmers" (8). And whether Marian Evans was ready to admit that her father Robert was the model for Adam or not, Blackwood reminded her that Mr. Simpson's observation was a "courteous tribute...to the life-like reality which pervades the whole book" (8). A carpenter's life was far less restricting for her than a sleepwalker's life.

The cabinet maker's observation that the writer of *Adam Bede* must have been "bred to the business" or must have spent a great deal of time listening to men raises questions concerning the gender of the narrative persona in this novel. Let us look at some of the events surrounding the publication of *Adam Bede*, for this was a controversial and

highly speculative time for "George Eliot."

As I discussed in chapter one, the controversy concerning the gender and identity of "George Eliot," the writer herself, permeated London upon the publication of *Mosses*, and it was at this particular point in her career that she decided to divulge her true identity to her immediate circle of friends and to her publishers. The opinions concerning the gender of "George Eliot" varied. Thomas Carlyle was sure that the author was a woman: "I found out in the first two pages that it was a woman's writing" (qtd. in Knight 171); his wife Jane Carlyle was convinced that "George Eliot" was a man, not a clergyman, but a "Black-Breath" (178); James Simpson, a professor of Midwifery at Edinburgh University, commented on the author's inconsistency in having Emily's premature baby "early" and "spooling," but praised the writer for being a "grand and glorious fellow" (qtd. in Knight 177 emphasis mine); and Charles Dickens, ever sure since the *Young* case that "George Eliot" was a woman, was even more convinced of her gender after having read *Mosses*, and requested a meeting with the author so that he could tell her why "I have used all my wits from Mosses Moss, and mailed my notes to the Post with 'Eve' upon them" (Letters III 118). Busy with his own work on *The Times*, William Thackeray did not respond to *Mosses*, but we may surmise that his opinion concerning the gender of the author of the *Young* might have

from the same for this new novel. According to Marian, "[Blackwood] told us that Thackeray spoke highly of the 'Woman' and said they were not written by a woman" (Letters II 485).

The controversy continued to linger, and the scandal over the infamous Joseph Higgins, who persistently claimed authorship of Miss Fife, forced Marian and George Lewis to take the action they had for so long avoided. To refute his claims, they chose to reveal Marian Evans Lewis as the true "George Eliot," author of Scenes of Clerical Life and Miss Fife (published in February of 1859), yet only to a select group of friends. Her true identity had been revealed to John Blackwood a little over a year before she chose to tell her friends in London--the Bays and Mrs. Russell--in June, 1858. They perhaps chose to reveal the secret to Blackwood to make business correspondence easier; Lewis was no longer required to serve as an intermediary or the spokesperson for his "mistaken friend," though he did on occasion correspond with Blackwood on Marian's behalf even after the identity was revealed. Having revealed her true identity to Mrs. and Charles Bay and Mrs. Russell, she still expressed a desire to keep her identity as well as uncertainly as it had previously been. The direct connection between Marian Evans Lewis and George Eliot seemed to be one which she desired to avoid. It appears that Marian Evans Lewis did not wish "George Eliot" to be tied down to one specific identity,

even after she had established herself as a well received, popular writer of fiction. In the following letter to the Kays and Mark Bennett, she takes a point of telling them that there is no "absolute authority" or certainty behind her acknowledgment of authorship; in fact the tone of the letter reveals that she would rather have the uncertainty surrounding the question of authorship than to be perceived as solely responsible for having written the works since she anticipates that other authors--perhaps more like Higgins--will come forward and claim co-authorship.

As far as the impostor--things must take their course. We can't help people saying yes that the books are mine, but the one point to secure is that we and our friends make no categorized statement which can be taken as absolute authority. As soon as the Higgins rehearsal is exhibited of course there will be twenty new ones in the place; and one of the first will be that I was not the sole author. The only safe thing for my mind's health is to shut my eyes and go on with my work. (Letters 121-22 emphasis mine)

The answer to the question of who "George Eliot" was, was as illusive as ever, and Marian Lewis wanted to keep it that way. I suspected that part of the reason she wanted "George Eliot" to be unidentified is that she wanted to be free to

novels, as in Emma and Jane Eyre, without the formal observation as what they were, but as images of their author. Only then, she may have believed, could she continue the larger portrait of English country life which she had planned.

She also had various pragmatic reasons for wanting the anonymity to which: the "George Eliot" mask protected her from her sensitivity to criticism, allowed her to write more freely (without the pressures of the traditional expectations and prejudices attached to the Victorian male (or female) reading a "mild" women's novel, and offered her the space in which to explore both the masculine and feminine points of view. But she did not wish to deny her pseudonym any more than she wished to claim and limit it.

When, during the negotiations for the publication of her next novel, The Mill on the Floss, she learned that the Blackwood publishers wanted to serialize her work in the Magazine without a name attached to it, she objected to the publishers' exploiting the uncertainty of "George Eliot." They presented this idea to her in the face of an "experiment" which would show them whether the other publishers could recognize her work without a name attached to it. They also wanted to check the other publishers, who, as they saw it, would never even imagine that another publisher would do something as outrageous as printing the great "George Eliot's" works without her name. In a letter

to Marian Lewis, William Blackwood tells her his reasons, "nothing equals the excitement of uncertainty," and "it would be great fun to watch the speculation as to the author's life" (Letters III 181). Yet Marian, feeling exploited, refused. Though she had felt quite comfortable with the uncertainty surrounding the name "George Eliot," she did not want her name or the absence of her name to be an experiment in gauging the curiosity of the reading public, the reaction of other publishers, or the general popularity of the work. Furthermore, the tactic appeared to be more a game than anything, a chance for the Blackwoods to see whether or not they could fool the other publishers in town by printing the words of the "famous" George Eliot, without the name. They also seemed to want to prove that they could get the quality of the art while ignoring the name of the artist. Blackwood writes: "the style would be to us really recognizable but to me, especially of the puffing writing and publishing order, would suppose that we would throw away such an advantage as getting the single words by George Eliot at the head of a series of papers" (181). The implication here is that they are much more interested in the intrigue of the enigmatic George Eliot than they are in her actual work. The uncertainty of the identity, which she had flourished under before, was now being exploited.

The Mill on the Floss did become serialized--this was her first serialized publication--and it appeared under the

name "George Eliot," as did all of her subsequent novels. The incident nearly caused the Blackwood publishers to lose one of their best selling authors. Only one other time was there contention concerning the use of the name "George Eliot," and this occurred--only covertly--when Marian Evans wrote "The Lifted Veil," the theme of which was a recognizable allegory of her desire to lift the veil, or her pseudonym, which was hiding the true author, Marian Evans.

The question of "George Eliot's" gender, particularly at the time of the publication of *Middlemarch*, intrigued both the London literary world and the reading public, which was fed gossip concerning the author through the columns in *The Times*. If we look closely at the observations made by Blackwood's friend Mr. Simpson, we can see that they suggest, perhaps, two different opinions concerning the author's gender, based primarily on the author's knowledge of *Middlemarch's* composition. First, he comments that "the writer must have been bred to the business [of carpentry]," which clearly suggests, considering the historical setting, that he believes that the writer is in fact a male. The second part of his comment is not quite as clear: "...or at all events passed a great deal of time in the workshop listening to the men"; he fact, it may suggest that he believes that the writer was a woman who spent her time listening to the men in the carpenter's shop. On the other hand, it may also suggest that he believes that the male writer's occupation

was not carpentry, but that he, perhaps as a younger boy, spent much time in the workshop. Clearly impressed by the author's familiarity with and realistic portrayal of a carpenter's life, Mr. Simpson's observations allow us the opportunity to examine the occupational status and gender of the narrator as well. The narrator of this novel has, not of friendship, a sympathetic connection with Ellen, which, I believe, is a much more human connection than we have seen previously in the Journal. Whether the narrator is male or female, he or she does not attempt to intervene in Ellen's life, or to understand his point of view by claiming affinity with or special knowledge of his occupation. (as "he" does in "Once Bitten") or even to use his or her relationship with the hero to offer commentary on the sorry conditions of women's education and the solemnity of church rites (as "he" does in "Janet's Baptism"). Instead, the narrator claims the most intimate type of relationship with the hero, and that is simple friendship. No longer constrained by the mask of the clerical or church member narrative that confined her to the setting, the actions, and the people of the church in Stories of Clerical Life, Ellen's larger canvas allowed her to release some of the authority and unique knowledge the narrator had over the hero and enabled her to concentrate instead on creating a single human affinity between the two.

In Ellen's Story, the George Eliot persona enabled Marian

leave to create yet another unspecified narrative persona, yet we must keep in mind that an unspecified gender meant that the gender was masculine, at least for the readers of the time. This time, the narrator is still sympathetically, yet much more productively, in touch with the hero of the novel. The first indication we have of the narrator's occupation in the world of *Adam Bede* is that he is a writer and a historian, and in the very same passage he makes reference to the occupation of the hero. "With this drop of ink at the end of my pen I will show you the roomy workshop of Mr Jonathan Burge, carpenter and builder in the village of Hayslope, as it appeared on the eighteenth of June, in the year of our Lord 1791" (18r ch.1). In chapter 12, he also refers to himself as a "judicious historian" who abstains from narrating in detail the ugly events and strong language which ensued between Arthur Donnithorne and his servant John when he had to be told that his favorite horse had become lame (172).

Nevertheless, with detailed descriptions of the sights, sounds, and smells of the carpenter's workshop, we are apt to believe that the narrator is a carpenter himself, though there is no evidence to support this. What we do know of the narrator's position in the Hayslope community is that he was a friend of Adam's, most likely a young friend, who gathered information from Adam concerning the community's opinions on particular people and events in order to write

his story. We may surmise that he knows so much about carpentry because he has been watching Adam. In this passage he reveals information about his relationship with Adam--to whom he refers by name--by recalling the differences between the Reverend Mr Twine and the Reverend Mr Hyde who came after him. He reveals here that he was given such information by Adam Hyde, who he knew personally. "But I gathered from Adam Hyde, to whom I talked of these matters in his old age, that few clergymen could be less successful in winning the hearts of their parishioners than Mr. Hyde" (218; ch.17 emphasis mine).

If there is any "fatherhood" in Eliot's narrator to Adam Hyde, I believe it is associated with the gender of her hero, Adam. There is a suggestive male bond between the two, yet I do not believe that Adam Hyde's narrator claims a particular sense of authority over Adam. Hans Isloff, however, suggests that George Eliot's masculine narrator, in all her works, "[render to] storytelling its authority" (188). She points out that while Adam is the original speaker, it is the male narrator who responds in his own voice. She also examines the narrator's relationship to Adam, for they are both storytellers in a sense; the young narrator is hearing the story of passion and murder from a man who has actually experienced it. The narrator, then, is telling us the story that Adam Hyde told him. She also attributes the masculine authority which Adam has to the

fact that he is, in relation to the time he is telling the narrator the story—a father, older and wiser than the young narrator himself. (Adam and Blank at the end of the novel have had two children.) The precedence of the narrator, according to Isidoff, depends upon "[Adam's] masculine story for the substance of recounting his conversation"; therefore, "this narrator requires the authority of storytellers because he heard this story from a father" (118; ch.5). Both the first-hand narrator (Blank) and the second-hand narrator (Adam) have authority in the narrative because of their gender, according to Isidoff. I contend, however, that authority is rendered neither to Adam nor to the narrator, whose gender is unspecified; rather, the true "authority" lies in the relationship itself.

Though sympathetic in "his" bond of friendship with Adam, the narrator also reveals a slightly critical bond between himself and Adam. This is a very different kind of sympathy from what we have seen in THE HOUSE OF GLASS, where the narrator expresses his need to sympathetically intercede for the suffering heir, or for those who cannot express sympathy at all. An example of this bond is revealed in a passage in which the narrator is trying to understand Adam's weakness for Betty. He does not know, but attempts to understand why Adam attributes "imaginary virtues to her" when he knows that she is actually in love with Arthur Samikwaana.

Of course, I know that, as a rule, sensible men fall in love with the most sensible women of their acquaintance, and through all the petty details of coquettish beauty, never imagine themselves loved when they are not loved, never loving on all proper occasions, and marry the women most fitted for them in every respect. (188; ch.II)

Noting that "my friend Adam" is an exception to this rule, this is the second and last time the narrated refers to him by name. Moreover, the passage indicates that not only a sympathetic, understanding bond exists between the two friends, but also that this is a male bond, that is, that they share a mutual understanding of the difficulties men have when they are in love with women. Whether or not they are men together, the reader is not addressed by a clearly female point of view; thus Eliot's narrator is free to tackle more directly those themes of masculine love, which would have had to be more obliquely handled by a clerical narrator or one gendered as clearly female.

Eliza Morris: The Public and Private Spheres of The Female Quixote

Eliza Morris is the first and last female clerical figure to appear in George Eliot's fiction. Though the context for this clerical role is not the same as it was in the *German*, [Eliza is not a preacher who works for or is attached to one particular parish], her clerical role retains

important questions. First, we must consider her gender and to what extent, if any, her gender is an issue as it pertains to her chosen profession. Certainly, Eliot shows how very talented Dinah is as a preacher. We hear, for example, the elegance of and the command with which she delivers her sermon on the cross in Bayville, and see the way in which she reaches several of her listeners that very day (Ch. 19). And though the nature of her professional ministerial work does not tie her to only one particular church and parish, Dinah, even after the very end of the novel when she is forced to give up public preaching or other vocations dear to her, insisting her denomination, does serve people within the context of a very specified role: that is, throughout the novel Eliot endows her with a very professional role. She has a named position; she is a public preacher and then a preacher in a private setting, one who in both instances has specific places at which to work and specific people and groups of people with whom to work.

At the same time that she is publicly proclaiming the Gospel, Eliot involves Dinah in the more private sphere of preaching as well. The nature of her private work is more random than in the public sphere for she often does not know when, where and with whom her work will be. As she continues to show her working in both the public and the private spheres, I will argue that with the example of

Dinah, Eliot is valuing the private sphere of religious teaching over the public sphere. This does not in any way reflect upon Dinah's gender and her ability as a woman to serve as an effective minister; indeed, Dinah is the most visible and most effective public minister figure of Eliot's early works. Nevertheless, we see, with the end of the novel when Dinah marries, leaves public preaching, and decides to use her religious training to reach people in the private sphere, that she has learned to practice, quite successfully, Eliot's "Religion of Humility," which can only be practiced successfully, whether one is male or female, in the private sphere. With this last clerical figure of the early works then, we see that, for Eliot, only in the private sphere can any meaningful religious teaching successfully occur. I shall examine John Hale's Dinah in light of Leach's theoretical emphasis upon otherness and also in light of Eliot's emphasis on meaningful religious teaching occurring in the private, more human sphere. We shall see then how Dinah struggles with and eventually achieves an understanding of her own personal otherness and finds as well a suitable sphere for her talents. In the end, I claim that she achieves a meaningful ministry which uses that otherness in a more personal and private religious setting.

Because Dinah's vocation as a public preacher determines the dramatic date of the novel, it is clearly of

great importance to Eliot. She chooses a time, specifically, when a branch of the Church of England that differed from the parent church in several significant ways, included--among those differences--the permission for women to preach. This period lasted from 1788 to 1803. Eliot chooses to place her story nearer to 1803, as we shall see. Thus Eliot's choice of time for the setting of Miss Fife allows the heroine, Miss, the opportunity to do a kind of public ministerial work designated by the status quo as anomalous. Miss performs the same kind of work as the characters of Woman of Cleland's Life--she preaches the same Gospel, delivers the same message--yet physically conducts her clerical duties in a very different way. The actual setting of Miss Fife then contributes much to the efficacy of Miss's work, especially as we examine her in relation to the two previous clerical figures, Anne Barton and Edgar Tryon, who, though introducing controversial and unfavorable ideas and practices themselves, work within churches which are much more established. Miss, however, is associated with and personally devoted to the Methodist society, which, at the time, was controversial in its progressive reforms, and in its allowing women to publicly preach, outside the walls of the church, the word of God. In the late 1780's, the Methodist society, founded by John and Charles Wesley to seek reform within the church of England, and to spread the Gospel to those alienated by the Established Church, was one

of the few which permitted women to preach and teach their faith in public places.

Concerning Elizabeth's status as a public preacher, Elliot makes the issue of her gender quite nebulous by emphasizing both the controversy behind her style of preaching as well as the controversy associated with her gender. Ironically however, both of these characteristics--her style of preaching in the open air and her gender--allow a much wider range of people to hear her. And as the listeners discuss her sermon among themselves, we shall see that it is difficult to determine which characteristic--her gender or the way in which she had delivered her message--was more impressive upon her listeners. The very unorthodox style of preaching outdoors, a style which is controversial in this part of England to begin with, whether the preacher is a male or a female, is associated with the name "Methodist." In England however, the name "Methodist" is almost always associated with Elizabeth, a female preacher who speaks out in the open air. And though both Hede is also known as a "Methodist," and is distinguished by Baylymore as such, he is not a public clerical figure. Elizabeth is publicly proclaiming the same Biblical messages as John Barlow and Robert Tryon, yet in a completely different setting. In her role as a "preacher woman" (44; ch. 2). Part of the clerical duties she performs are those which we have seen before, that is, reaching out to a variety of people with a

variety of needs. Clergymen like Jane Barton and Edgar Tryon either attempted to perform or failed at such duties. But we now see Hinch performing them within a much larger scope. These duties are now enhanced and enlarged because Hinch, working as a Methodist preacher, is not constrained by the confines of a church building and a specific congregation. The very physical setting for her preaching--in the open, on the street--is indicative of her larger scope. This freedom enables her to reach people wherever, whenever, and for any length of time she is needed. She can, for example, leave the Payson's Hall Park to attend to Elizabeth's needs after her husband's death, or she can leave Stratford to attend to Betty's needs at the prison at Fitchburg. She therefore has an enlarged opportunity to perform both public and private ministries.

Hinch helps make the feminine longing by giving to a woman the voice to spread the Word of God in public and allowing both women and men to hear it. But her interest in inclusiveness is not restricted to issues of gender. Though there is much controversy surrounding Hinch's preaching on the Reynolds Green, it is difficult to discern whether it is her gender or her style of preaching which attracts her listeners the most. Those who come to hear Hinch speak in a public setting appear to be drawn to her because of her style of preaching and because of what she is saying: that is, because she is a Methodist with a particular style of

preaching that interests them, and not necessarily because she is a woman. Eliot makes the issue of gender quite nebulous by adding to the situation yet another controversial issue.

Both women and men do come to hear Dinah; but, as we shall see, all have different reasons for coming. Mr. Cascon, who (prior to his negative comments about Dinah's Methodist style of preaching, not her gender, tells the stranger who has come to listen that most of the Methodists on the Green, both male and female, come from Tradilston, a nearby town--"That's where our people gets it from," he says (48; ch.4). Though he does not identify how many Methodist men come from Tradilston, he does make a point of telling the stranger that the number of male Methodists in Hayslope is very low. "There's only two men of 'em in all Hayslope that's Will Haskins, the wheelwright, and Seth Redd, a young man that works at the carpenter's" (48; ch.4). Mr. Cascon's observations appear to have much to do with his own quantity concerning the presence of Methodism in his town, rather than his concern that a woman is preaching.

Many women are intrigued by Dinah's public message and because most of the people sitting on the Green are women, we see that her ministry to them is not solely confined to personal confrontations such as those with Elizabeth Redd, Mrs. Foyner, and Betty. There is a budding of sorts and a sense of isolation among these women artfully waiting--in public--

to hang what Dinah has to say. The listeners who passively watch are all men, enthralled by the "quaker-like costume" and the "old deportment of the female Methodist" (41; ch.2). Thus, the men curiously watch as the trainee becomes an active and public part of a predominantly masculine arena. On the first occasion in the novel in which Eliot represents Dinah's preaching, the only woman visibly and actively affected by her words is a woman, Henry Gossage, who finds Dinah's message concerning sinful, worldly ways so strongly that she takes her large earrings off and, enraged, throws them to the ground. Her father's reaction to her's softened nature--"[it strikes] him as nothing less than a miracle" (51; ch.2)--reveals that the power of Dinah's public preaching is taken seriously by a male as well. Her ministry, then, cannot potentially be considered a female phenomenon, for her work affects both both men and women, as well as Mr. Irvine, the sexton.

Besides associating the name "Methodist" with a female preacher and a primarily female gathering, Eliot also shows how the women's names themselves are tailored to have an association with parts of the personal names of other men and women, fathers and cousins in the family. That which is feminine then becomes a part of the formerly all masculine vision quo, which is exactly what we see happening with Dinah Harris as she becomes a part of the more public world hitherto belonging solely to the likes of Anne Barton and

Oliver Tryon. This changing of the status quo is accomplished by the way in which one family shares parts of both masculine and feminine names to make one name. For example, Henry George himself, "the Blacksmith's woman daughter," is known to her neighbors as "Good's Son," in distinction to Timothy's Son, Henry's cousin and "nephew" (44; ch.2). Timothy's Son, then, has a part of Henry George's name. To be someone's nephew is very important to this particular family, and these names do not suggest male ownership or male dominance of any kind. The masculine part of both of their names appears to be a tradition having to do with "retaining [their] maiden appellation" (44; ch.2): that is, retaining part of their father's name. This tradition does not appear to be a derogatory statement on the condition of women; the public status quo is being shared now, not infiltrated by either women or men. We see, for example, that Timothy's Son's child, though a male, receives a part of his name: he is named Timothy's Son's Son, which retains affectionately for him both a part of his mother's name and a part of his grandfather's name as well. This affectionate naming process reminds us of Marjorie Lewis' own reasons for choosing "George Eliot" as her pen name, for she claimed that she chose "George," only part of the name, out of respect and affection for George Henry Lewis. The Blacksmith woman retains their membership in this community of naming: a twinned status quo. It seems, could be inclusive

of the working people of England. Moreover, the workers' commentary might be seen as being more open than the gentry class to indicating a more feminine status quo. Anne Barker and Edgar Tryan of Eliot's previous works would not ignore that class. Dinah Morris, however, is a clerical figure who, working in the gaps, away from the established church, is free from the direct congregational tensions which we see in both Shagarton and Hilby churches. Gossip concerning Anne and the Countess occurred in Shagarton church, and the Hilby church was torn in two by the Tryanites and the Lord Nymphones. Nevertheless, Eliot does not free Dinah from the gossiping which surrounds the two controversial aspects of her occupation--the fact that she is a Methodist and the fact that she is a female. Her work is defined very early in the novel by these two labels, which to some appear to be inextricably intertwined, and which themselves both aspects of the status quo--the masculine clerical world and the established church of England. Whether her controversial gender orientation has controversial style of preaching, or vice versa, appears to depend on the opinions of individual Nymphones.

We see, for example, that Mr Casson of Nymphone notes the connection between "Methodist" preacher and "female" preacher when he tells the stranger who has inquired about a "girl" on the street: "It's a Methodist' preaching, sir; it's her, yer know, as a young woman's a-going to preach on the

know^o (30: 28.2). Mr. Casse's observation suggests that the gender of the preacher is understood if the style of preaching is understood, and most people in the community, though not the stranger, would recognize that connection. As his dialogue with the stranger continues, we recognize Mr. Casse's opinions concerning this type of preaching, though it is not clear that his derogatory comments have anything to do with Black's gender.

She's out there to Popen's wife, as they'll be fine an' vexed at her for making a fool of herself i' that way. But I've heard as there's no holding those Methodists when the sabbath's come an' i' their hands may of 'em go stark starkin' and wif their religion. (40: 28.2)

Whether Black is a male or a female, it appears that Mr. Casse dislikes the style of preaching much more than he dislikes the fact that a woman is preaching in the first place.

Another member of Synops's community on Black's preaching is Wury Men. More distant in his observations concerning her gender, he associates the physical appearance of the preacher with the efficacy of the preacher's message, suggesting that people will lend an ear to a pretty preacher. "I'll stick up for the pretty women preacher: I know they'd persuade me over a dead woman ear th' wily men" (40: 28.2). He also notes the

message itself, implying that being "persecuted" by a woman's preaching--using Beth's relationship with Eliza as an example--merely offers the male listener the opportunity to court that woman. "I shouldn't wonder if I turn Methodist when the night's out, as begin to court the preacher, like Beth used" (40; ch.3). This shows that that being a female in a primarily masculine professional position can have its consequences, but does not present the problem as exclusively a form of sexism which overtake the woman's talents because of her physical appearance.

Beth's own aunt and uncle, the Poyers, also voice strong opinions concerning her preaching. Mrs Poyer, in particular, voices her opinion on two counts. First, she sees Beth's preaching as a hindrance to her maintaining her feminine status quo, that is, the possibility of her more natural, more acceptable role as a wife with a family. Mrs Poyer tells her: "You might get married to some decent man, and there'd be plenty ready to have you, if you'd only leave off that preaching" (112; ch.3). Mrs Poyer also seems to object to Beth's preaching as a lifestyle on the grounds that it is not a practical way to spend one's life. In the following quotation, she does not designate a gender when she refers to "everybody"; indeed, she seems to be voicing her opinions about the vagina of Methodist preachers, in general, who devote their life to preaching and who give up the chance to have a family, as much as she is chastising

Dinah for making them choose herself.

If everybody was to do like you, the world must
come to a standstill....everybody'd be waiting
bread and o' this and, and everybody'd be
running after everybody else to preach to 'em,
instead o' bringing up their families, and laying
by a hot harvest. (122; ch.4)

Mrs Poyser's final comment in this argument is that
Dinah's preaching in public is a disgrace to the family. It
is difficult to discern whether this comment has more to do
with Dinah's gender or with her style of preaching, but it
is a direct comment on the way Mrs Poyser believes Dinah
should be leading her life. As Arthur Sandthorne and Mr
Irvine the rector approach the Hall Gate, Mrs Poyser is
convinced that they have come to complain about her
preaching as the women and tell Dinah that she will have to
handle this, that she has said enough already about her
"bringing such disgrace up" [her] uncle's family"(123;
ch.4). While Mrs Poyser is quick to complain about the
public embarrassment she feels on Dinah's account, it is
important to note that she enjoys the benefits of Dinah's
own personal ministerial work at home. After they leave,
Mrs Poyser is surprised to find that Dinah's conversation
with Mr Irvine was "pleasant," and that her--the threatened
representative of the masculine ethics quo--did not "scold"
her for preaching (124; ch.4). Even this she attributes to

his style or his way with people as a pastor, claiming that his words, unlike those of the Methodists, are "comfortable-like" (139; ch.8). Mr Irvine, then, is Mrs Fymer's idea of a proper clerical leader, and represents for her an example of the authoritative clerical status quo.

Mr Irvine, an established religious leader who does not threaten the established status quo, questions Bink's choice of vocation in a way that reveals his curiosity and intrigue about her public ministry. His questioning of her, however, is based upon the similarities they share, and not on any judgemental opinions about such a choice, or about what Bink is "supposed" to do. Mr Irvine's questions concerning Bink's choice have much to do with his desire to have an understanding of her motivation for choosing this lifestyle. Some questions directly address her gender, others do not, yet all have much more to do with his desire to know what her own personal spiritual foundation was, a curiosity which is apparently based on the similarities in occupation they share. He asks, for example, how she first "came to think of preaching?" (148; ch.8). In a reply which is very much in line with Bink's character as well as her preaching style, she tells the story of her own personal feelings about her faith and her God. "Oh wasn't it I could sit alone all day long with the thought of God overflowing my soul" (150; ch.8). Mr Irvine asks more specifically, apparently out of his own need to understand

what exactly it is that attracts Bink to this style of preaching, the particular of the very day on which she began to preach(118). Bink shares these with her as well, relating the experience of how she took over one day for an ailing man, "another Marlowe," who was to preach to the poor, but suddenly fell ill. It must be noted, however, that Mr Irvine does not share with Bink any reasons for his own choice to enter this same, or at least very similar, vocation.

The odd number of references which Mr Irvine does make to her gender, I believe, reveal his attempt to understand her position, knowing himself the difficulties she must face. Again, it is important to note that there is no sharing on Mr Irvine's side; thus, we cannot see this as a two-way, sympathetic relationship, as we are, for example, between the clerical narrator and Anne in "The Red Fortunes of Miss Barton." Bink is the only party who is sharing. First, he wishes to know clearly that the Methodists support women preaching. Using a rhetorical question, designed that he might gain more insight, he asks: "your society sanctions women's preaching, then?"(119; ch.4). Her response indicates that she understands his curiosity. She does not answer definitively in support of women, but her answer does reveal that she does not fear men denying the work she does, particularly when it is God's spirit, not man's, calling. We see in the following passage that she

believes in the supremacy of God, who discards those who serve his purposes of their gender, over the supremacy of [human] men on the Council[] of Methodist preaching the do.

I understand there's been voices raised against it in the Society of Lake, but I cannot but think their counsel will come to naught. It isn't for him to make channels for God's Spirit, as they make channels for the water-courses and say, 'Flow here, but flow not there.' (114; ch.4)

Perhaps because he is trying to skirt the issue of women making a mistake by entering God's service, he asks a question which refers to both men and women in this light, not just women alone.

Don't you find sometimes that both men and women fancy themselves channels for God's Spirit and are quite mistaken, so that they set about a work for which they are unfit, and bring holy things into contempt? (114; ch.4)

Bink answers this question--in terms of addressing the issue of gender--as cryptically as Mr Irwin asked it.

"There's a very strict order kept among us, and the brothers and sisters watch for each other's souls as they that must give account" (114; ch.4 emphasis mine). Though both refer to each gender in this exchange, Mr Irwin's underlying intention is to force Bink to "own up" to the difficulties which arise due to the combination of her vocation and her

gender. Elizabeth's response does not exclusively excuse the woman or the man from wrongdoing, nor does it equal the virtues of one over the other. What it does do is give equal accountability to each gender.

Having resigned himself to Elizabeth's genuine commitment to and faithfulness towards her vocation, and having heard the story of her devotion, Mr Irwin, who at this point was "deeply interested" (198: ch.8) by her, chooses to ask her the most direct question concerning her gender and her work, for he questions specifically the "embarrassment" she might feel from having young men admire her beauty. "Had you never feel any embarrassment from the sense of your youth--that you are a lovely young woman on whom men's eyes are fixed?" (198: ch.8). He suggests here that the "embarrassment" he is referring to is her beauty, and that it may be a distraction and most likely a hindrance to the efficiency of her work. This concern has already become a reality if we recall the words of Wray Bee who bluntly states that the beauty of the female preachers gives him more reason to listen than if the preachers were an "ugly man," nevertheless, this cannot be seen as an either/or defeat on Elizabeth's part; Wray Bee is still listening to and hearing Elizabeth's message, whether it is for the wrong reasons or not.

The reason, perhaps, that Mr Irwin considers her work an embarrassment has more to do with his professional opinion of her as a woman working in public than with his

personal opinion of the validity of her choice. He sees Miss's beauty as a stumbling block to those men she might otherwise have reached. He sees then how Miss connects with the issue of women having public roles without embarrassment, for she shows how Mr Irvine assumes that any "decent" woman who is the object of a male gaze in public will be embarrassed. He thinks that women must avoid public life to avoid this form of violation. In response, Miss does underestimate the validity of Mr Irvine's concern about the way in which her physical appearance affects her male listeners. "I've no room for such feelings, and I don't believe the people ever take notice of that" (118; ch.8). In fact, she turns the comment around and poses the problem as one which reveals how the "rough, ignorant people" (118; ch.8) affect her. "I've preached to as rough ignorant people as can be in the villages about Snowfield--men that look very hard and wild; but they never said an unkind word to me" (118-119; ch.8).

In denying that looks, that is, the impressions her listeners receive--were important, while acts and speech-acts are acceptable, Miss takes a serious error. She poses too much importance on her validity as a spiritual leader and overlooks the reality of the public's perception of herself: that is, of her physical youth and beauty. Even with Miss's habit of overlooking her audience's reception of any aspect of her preaching, that not only the content of

what she is saying will be evaluated and judged, but the fact that the female body which speaks it may overshadow that very content. Mr Irvine comes to respect her dedication and determination to overcome such obstacles. At the end of their discussion, Mr Irvine recognizes that Bink has both a stubborn self-importance about her work as well as a sincere desire to do work which is most natural for her. And this desire he sees as most admirable, for he recognizes that Bink's God-given talents should not be questioned or evaluated as a sign of her own feeling of self-importance. He thinks to himself: "He must be a miserable prig who would not the pedagogues have one night as well go lecture the trees for growing in their own shape" (191: 24-5). With this recognition, he begins speaking to her as a more equal, professional based, inquiring about her opinion of her audience as the Green. Bink may have an literary perception of the way in which her gender is perceived as she works, yet even a male professor can recognize her dedication to her work, her natural talent for her work, and her conviction that she can do her work well in spite of her gender.

When working privately with people, Bink is an inspiring presence; in any given situation, she often appears to be in control, to be the offerer, not the receiver of either sympathy or happiness. Like Edgar Tryon, she appears to have a problem accepting as her own the happiness which

comes from experiencing true otherness. When she talks with Beth that she desires to live and die without a husband or children, she explains "I seem to have no room in my soul for wrath and fears of my son, it has pleased God to fill my heart so full with the wants and sufferings of his poor people" (50; ch.10). She appears to enjoy this one-way relationship because it offers her a sense of self-satisfying accomplishment. In her relationship with Betty, for example, she is happy that Betty is clinging to her, but only for Betty's sake. In this passage, she seems to be happier that Betty is receiving human sympathy and feeling from this interchange, but does not acknowledge that she is receiving anything from Betty in return. Of the incident, she tells Adam "I must hasten back to her, for it is wonderful how she clings now, and was not willing to let me out of her sight. She used never to make any return to my affection before, but now tribulation has opened her heart" (100-101; ch.14). Her emphasis upon giving and not upon receiving or accepting sympathy--joy, sorrow, or even pain--from others then reveals a sense of illusory self-sufficiency. In another example, we see that the hard-working Mrs Rogers is justly insulted when Black tells her her reasons for leaving the Rail Farm to go back to Moorfield. "It is useful for us, you, and that I should go away from this life of care and toils, in which I have all things too richly to enjoy" (109; ch.16) emphasizes almost. Mrs

perhaps finds Miss's explanation difficult to swallow. That Miss sees this life as one of "Gimmery" is an indication that she does not recognize the difficult financial situation they have been struggling with as a part of her own struggle. By emphasizing her need for her own independent and self-sustaining status, she is denying her need for meaningful human relationships. In other words, she has difficulty participating in the otherness--the personal concern, the personal joys, which a relationship with the Popeye offers.

Miss leaves Miss in a matrimonial and domestic position at the end of the novel, for, having chosen to marry Adam, become a mother, and leave the public part of her ministry behind, Miss is no longer a female part of or a female threat to the masculine status quo. Many feminist interpretations of the end of the novel see Miss's choice as an easy compromise, regarding it as her giving into the patriarchal society which governed the lives of Victorian women. There are two parts to the argument that says she is compromising in this way. First, many argue that she chooses to be a slave to the predominant feminine status quo by marrying and having children as she has been expected to do. The second argument is that she chooses to give up her work in public ministry.

I believe that each of these decisions must be examined separately, for her difficult decision to marry has

little to do with her leaving public preaching, and more to do with her concern that the marriage will affect her personal devotion to God. The difficulty of her decision, then, has to do with the private, not the public aspects of her faith. We see that her apprehension has much to do with her not wanting to give up her devotion to God for the sake of loving and sharing her life with another. In the following passage it appears that she feels she can only live a life loving either God or Adam; thus, she refers to a "division" within her heart, a division which she sees as existing. "Since my affections have been not above measure on you, I have had less peace and joy in God: I have felt as if it were a division in my heart" (104; ch.31). After telling Adam that she must take some time away from him to decide, declaring that "we must submit ourselves entirely to the Divine Will" (104; ch.31), she returns to him, assured that "it is the Divine Will" (174; ch.34) that they be together. Yet this time she is affirmed by the Holy Spirit that she can love both Adam and God; in fact, she also believes that her life with Adam will preserve her devotion to God. Thus we see in Hinch's decision a desire to maintain her spiritual dedication as well as her willingness to kindle a new desire; that is, to share a part of herself by loving another human being. Thus, the "divided life" she refers to here is her recognition of Adam as the missing part of her life, a part, which, like her love for her God,

make her life meaningful.

My soul is so knit to yours that it is but a divided life I live without you. And this moment, now you are with me, and I feel that our hearts are filled with the same love, I have a fullness of strength to bear and do our heavenly Father's will, that I had lost before. (1911 ch.14).

I believe that the last phrase, which refers to Bink's "fullness of strength" to do her heavenly Father's will, reveals that she now recognizes her need for human relationships in addition to her need for a divine relationship with God.

Bink's second controversial decision--to leave public preaching yet still retain a part of it by visiting people "in his in their houses" (1911 epilogue)--can be seen as an easy compromise if we look at it from Ruth's point of view: Ruth encourages the more public part of Bink's work, the actual preaching to people outdoors. Yet Ellet shows that the historical restrictions of time have as much to do with Bink's choice to leave preaching as her own personal desires to lead a more "typical" woman's life. In 1921, the Conference of Methodist Preaching forced women to preach. Seeing Bink as a universal, Ruth believes she should have "left the Episcopate and joined a body that'd put no hands on Christian liberty" (1911 epilogue). Yet even this move might be seen as a compromise for Bink herself, since she

was deeply inspired by hearing Wesley himself preach when she was a young girl (18-4; ch.1) and has a deeply-rooted devotion to the Methodist denomination.

Seen from Dinah and Adam's point of view, we might interpret Dinah's choice to leave public ministry as one which actually does reveal her as a member of *serio* among women. As Adam explains Dinah's decision to Seth (and it does appear to be Dinah's own decision, for Adam suggests that there was an agreement between the two and that she voiced her own opinion: "She was right and thou wast wrong," he says to Seth [813; epilogue]), there is an understanding that Dinah left public preaching as that other women preachers who were not so good, who were actually doing the ministry here, might follow her example. In this sense, Dinah may be seen as a kind of heroine, for she is in essence "weeding out" weak female preachers who are giving the Methodist society a bad name. According to Adam:

Most o' the women do worse here nor good with their preaching—they've not got Dinah's gift nor her spirit; and she's seen that, and she thought it right to set th' example o' substituting, for she's not hard from other sermons o' teaching.

(1813; epilogue)

Moreover, this decision does not entirely exclude Dinah from the work she does so well. Her hand is still in the private part of her ministry, the part of ministry which

Eliah herself valorizes. Eliah also suggests that there be simply too much definition associated with Eliah's work. As a female Methodist preacher, she was not trying to infiltrate the male status quo, but was simply trying to do her own work, attempting to serve her God without the assistance of a defined gender pulling her down.

Furthermore, I believe that Eliah is making her own commentary on the state of religious teaching in general. With the example of Eliah, she tends to valorize the private sphere of religious teaching, with its emphasis on human to human relationships. Having left the public sphere of teaching, Eliah can now concentrate on father, sister human connections.

Eliah's Mirrors, Illusions, and the Other

Eliah's Betty served exemplifies the vice the Victorians criticized the most; that is, selfish egotism, particularly egotism which involves one's beauty. Isaac himself claimed that the function of the ego is purely imaginary. The subject, as he saw it in Freud's teachings, is continuously adjusting to its social environment in order to strengthen his or her ego, and is therefore always seeking mastery. This kind of mastery, which is controlled by the subject's quest for wholeness or unity, is imaginary, as we have seen, for Isaac theorized that human quest is based upon uncertainty and upon rather unstable tensions. Isaac claims that it is the ego which controls

these imaginary guests. Furthermore, during the subject's childhood, the imaginary relationship the child has with his or her own mirror image is the foundation for such guests later in life. We shall see that in these themes, Eliot again almost anticipates Lacan. Eliot's portrayal of Betty's epique as one which is centered on mirrors is strikingly similar to Lacan's theory of epique as it is expressed in "The Mirror Stage." I will claim then that Betty's age is built up by her attempt to obtain an imaginary mastery of her own mirror image. We shall also see how Betty makes her mirror image her own subject of narcissistic the imaginary vision of her ideal life which it offers her, I claim, is her objet a.

Betty's epique self image is not solely centered upon her vanity as one might believe; on the contrary, it is much more far-reaching than a superficial love of her own beauty. It is one which deceives her enough that she believes she can use that beauty to carry out of her original and more natural social status. It is an epique self image which reinforces who and what she is, which deceptively tells her that she is a fine lady, and not simply a pretty millmaid. It is a self image and illusory vision, then, of that which is beyond her, that which is outside of her grasp, yet one on which she continually feeds, which continually gives meaning to her dull, ordinary existence. It is a self image which she cannot "get on," one which is unrepresentable,

nostalgic. The source of Betty's spin, then, I claim, is her mirror image, that image which keeps her in the imaginary realm of narcissistic fascination about her beauty and which allows her to see an illusory wholeness and to create an imaginary gaze concerning her social status, a wholeness she can never "get at." This section will also examine the way in which Arthur Dimmesdale helps to sustain Betty's imaginary and illusory image of herself. For Arthur serves as yet another form of a mirror for her, perpetuating and associating her imaginary visions (just as her objective mirrors do).

In Lacanian terms, Betty herself is not a subject of certainty in the way that, as we have seen, some of Eliot's previous characters are. She does not impose her authority upon others as we have seen Robert Despatch, the Countess Chelinski, or Kate Barton do in previous works, though her insistence on staying in the "Mirror Stage" and placing an authoritative certainty upon her mirror image greatly affects others around her, as we shall see. She does exist in the Lacanian imaginary realm, and with her constant reliance on her mirrors to ground her in her own subjectivity, I claim that her mirror image functions as her subject of certainty because it imposes back on her a reflection of a reality which she can never attain, a reality nevertheless that is to her her life's nourishment. Her mirror then is reflecting back on her an imaginary

vision of herself, one which I claim is her object, the imaginary object which, according to Lacan, always escapes one, an object which is constantly beyond the mirror.

The second point to be made concerning this imaginary mirror stage does not concern only Betty (the subject) herself, but her relationships with others as she continues to see herself as what Lacan calls the "Ideal I" (*Image E*). Lacan calls this narcissistic image of one's self the "ideal I" because "this sense of self will also be the source of secondary identifications" [2]. He continues.

The important point is that this core identifies the agency of the ego, before its social determination, in a fictional direction.... which will only retain the imagined-to-being (in French) of the subject asymptotically, whatever the means of the dialectical synthesis by which he must realize as I his discrepancy with his own reality. (8 emphasis added)

In other words, the subject's (in this case Betty's) relationships with others will be as imaginary or "fictioned" as the imaginary mirror stage identification she has with her own self. She sees the other only in the narcissistic form of a mirror image of herself. Anything associated with the other will be thought of only as it relates to the object of her own desire; that is, that which will become more real to her than the feelings which the

object as the OTHER refuses directly in her (Spence 147).

That Eliot depicts an actual subjective relationship existing between a human being and an inanimate object such as a mirror indicates the proximity to Lacan of the tradition in which George Eliot was working. In both Eliot and Lacan, the subject attempts to have meaningful interaction with the mirror. For Lacan, this involves a seemingly meaningful interaction, an imaginary interaction, between the subject and her image in the mirror, that image which she attempts to grasp and have as her own. For Eliot, the actual physical mirror itself as well as the very image in it both become the other and reveal the equivocal relationship Betty has with herself. Betty's mirror, the instrument which reveals her complete, flawed image back to her, is her best friend. Similarly, Lacan emphasizes the imaginary relationship the subject creates between herself and the non-threatening, apparently whole image of herself which she sees in it. Only the hard, cold glass of the objective mirror interrupts this imaginary image of the self and the body as whole and complete. For Lacan, when the subject recognizes that her relationship with the mirror image is broken off by the mirror, and that the self which she sees is actually fragmented, that the ideal union between the self and the image no longer exists, the subject can then situate herself in complex and meaningful relationships with others. I claim that Betty does not

experience this break with "The Mirror Stage," that instead she remains in the imaginary realm which helps her maintain unity with herself, and that she continues to stay in the imaginary realm by clinging to her mirror image, her subject of certainty.

We may begin then with Eliza's striking portrayal of Betty's almost human relationship with one of her two mirrors in chapter 18. What makes a marked distinction between the two mirrors by showing how Betty has two very distinct ways of watching her reflection every day. She considers the mirror allotted to her by the Popeans necessary only for the very basic needs of her daily routine of basic grooming. Though it is quite inadequate to reflect back her face as certain, whole, or perfect, Betty tolerates it because it serves its purpose as a utility which gets her through the day. "She could see a reflection of herself in the old-fashioned looking-glass, which was distinct as needed, considering that she had only to touch her hair and was on her right way" (284; ch.18 emphasis mine). This mirror, along with its base, is an antique with "varnished gilding about it" and a "fine antique base." It was considered a valuable possession to the Popeans who had bought it "a quarter of a century before, at a sale of antique household furniture" (284; ch.18). Nevertheless, we see how anxiously Betty regards the very function of a mirror, any mirror, in general. She admits

this same mirror, this mirror which has very ordinary functions, with subjective, almost human characteristics by engaging in an emotional interchange with it. In this passage, Betty expresses her appreciation--in a very personal and subjective way--over the shortcomings of this mirror. "A queer old looking-glass! Betty got into an ill-temper with it almost every time she dressed" (144; ch.38). We see then that Betty recognizes her need for a mirror that can offer her a less tainted image of herself, and that she cannot function, even on a daily basis, with this warped image.

Betty's anger with the objective mirror, the mirror (that), is related, I believe, to the illusory image of herself which it is unable to reflect back. Because of its physical inadequacies, Betty "objects" to the mirror -- it has "numerous air blotches splashed over it, which no rubbing would remove" (144; ch.38). This mirror then forces her to see a somewhat important image of herself. Significantly, Betty does not recognize or refuse to recognize that this mirror is actually showing her a somewhat fragmented image. And though she knows that the blotches are on the mirror (that), and that this particular mirror does not adequately reflect her physical form, we see that Betty is dependent upon the outside, whole, completely contained image which she thrives on.

That Betty cannot "get at" her image, or physically be

et une with her legs is seen in the physical effort and energy she expends in order to achieve the best view of herself in this very disagreeable mirror. Besides the blotches, Betty complains about the limited movement of the mirror which limits the number of possible views she can get of herself.

Instead of swinging backwards and forwards, it was fixed in an upright position, so that she could only get one good view of her head and neck, and that was to be had only by sitting down on a low chair before her dressing-table. (114) ch.15

Even though Betty recognizes that the hard, cold objective nature of the mirror is keeping her from achieving the oneness or unity with her image, she still insists on rejecting any kind of fragmentation from it. She goes to great lengths to see as much of her body as possible--her head and neck all at once. This suggests that that the wholeness, the completeness of her physical body is as important to her as the whole, complete image she has of her subjective self. The walls and necks her mirror image to be her subject of certainty. By clinging to the only otherness she knows--the otherness of her mirror image--she is repelling all possibility of having meaningful subjective relationships. Indeed, she sees all of the possible judgments which would produce fragmentation from her image as bothersome and unnecessary quibbles which simply exist to

create physical discomfort. We see, for example, that because of the "big brass handles" at her knees, "she couldn't get near the glass at all comfortably" (194; ch.15). Betty ignores all possible means which would bring her into the Lacanian symbolic order of subjective identification.

Secretly locked away, Betty keeps her other mirror, one which is not haunted. "A small red-framed looking-glass, without hitches" (194; ch.15), this is the mirror she prefers to the larger one which has so many physical limitations and defects. Confident enough in the image she receives from this less flawed mirror, she lays it aside, and chooses to create yet another illusory image of herself by letting down her hair to "make herself look like that picture of a lady in Miss Aggie Bonwithorne's dressing-room" (195; ch.15). It is important to note that with this less imperfect mirror not only does Betty achieve an illusory image of the wholeness and completeness of her beauty, but she also creates an illusory vision of the life she might have if she lived in the same social class as Miss Aggie Bonwithorne. Elton herself uses language similar to Lacan's, referring to Betty's vision for her life as an "imaginary dress" which made her "shocks [flashes] and her eyes [glitches]" (200; ch.15). Quoted below at length is her imaginary vision. With her objects around her and Jack within her grasp--her large earrings, her neck, and her

best mirror, she is transported into her vision, one which she believes is also just within her grasp.

Captain Bernithorne couldn't like her to go on doing work: he would like to see her in nice clothes, and thin shoes and white stockings, perhaps with silk cloaks to them: for he must love her very much--no one else had ever put his arm round her and kissed her in that way. He would want to marry her and make a lady of her....6. It was impossible to think how it would be!....And nothing could be so it had been again: perhaps some day she should be a grand lady, and ride in her coach, and dress for dinner in a broadened silk, with feathers in her hair and her dress sweeping the ground. (194-7; ch.14)

The portrait then serves as yet another type of mirror, for when she looks at it, she does not see Miss Lydia, but herself, the imaginary Betty who is permitted to love and to live a life with Captain Arthur Bernithorne, who is otherwise inaccessible to Betty the dairymaid who lives and works with the boys.

Nevertheless, because Betty is so enveloped in her vision, she does not recognize that her heart has been caught on the mirror, and when she stands up, the mirror falls to the floor. "At the thought of all this splendour, Betty got up from her chair, and in doing so caught the

little red-framed glass with the edge of her scarf, so that it fell with a bang on the floor" (197: ch.13). Now the mirror was caught by her scarf which served as the intruder--for it caused the mirror to "[fall] with a bang"--in this imaginary "relationship" is significantly ironic because her scarf, like her other secret possessions, also functions as an *objet a*, that which represents the unattainable. In Lacan's theory, the *objet a*, once they have "broken away from" the whole, can become part of the symbolic order of meaningful signification. I contend that this is the way in which we can view the function of one of Betty's previous objects, for it is almost "asking" her to break away from it. This imaginary object interferes with the imaginary connection between the objective self and the visionary self in the mirror, suggesting perhaps that the whole, imaginary self break away from itself. Instead of recognizing this need to break away, instead of recognizing that the mirror is almost "requesting" this break because the mirror itself breaks away from her, instead of recognizing this request that she frequent herself from her image and from her vision, Betty continues to perpetuate the vision--now without the help of the mirror. Eliot notes that "she was too eagerly occupied with her vision to care about picking it up" (197: ch.14). This seems to suggest that once Betty has the imaginary vision, the mirror itself is no longer important. Indeed, her recognition that the

mirror has fallen is marked only by "a momentary start" (187; 46.18) and she immediately "[regains] to pose with a pigeon-like stolidness backward and forward along her room, in her secured stays and coloured skirt, and the odd black lace scarf round her shoulders, and the green glass earrings in her ears" (187; 46.18). It appears then that Betty can perpetuate her imaginary vision without the help of the mirror because she has so many other objects--her colorful skirt, her lace scarf, and her green earrings--to replace the one that was lost. And instead of recognizing the actual break from the mirror as a symbol of her need to break away from her self and to see herself and others in a fragmentary way, Betty merely replaces the lost imaginary object with others that are just as imaginary and which perpetuate the imaginary vision just as well.

There is yet another aspect of Betty's experience with her gaze in the mirror, which, I believe, is fundamental to her image of herself as unified and absolute, and we can again turn to Laura in order to illuminate Elliot's own commentary on her egoism and vanity. In her imaginary fantasy of her life with Arthur, Betty, on this particular confrontation with her mirror image, imagines that Arthur is watching her,

And Betty looked at herself to-night with quite a different sensation from what she had ever felt before: there was an invisible spectator whose eyes

before: there was an invisible spectator whose eyes

_____ traced on her lips working on the flowers. His
 soft voice was saying over and over again those
 pretty things he had said in the woods; his arm was
 round her, and the delicate movement of his hair
 was with her still. The wisest woman is never
 _____ thoroughly conscious of her own beauty till she is
 _____ loved by the man who asks her own passing vibration
 _____ in return. (1941 ch.18 emphasis mine)

Lacan's theory of the gaze parallels Elliot's insights on
 vain women. He calls this particular subject an "obsessive
 being" who is "all seeing" (*The Four Fundamental Concepts of
 Psychoanalysis* 28). By her making Betty's desirability
 observer an "invisible spectator," we can see that Elliot
 recognizes her need to be the obsessive all-seeing, and also
 her desperate desire to be seen. She can see the spectator
 watching her, but the spectator should not let on that he
 knows that she is aware of his gaze. According to Lacan,
 "This all-seeing aspect is to be found in the satisfaction
 of a woman who knows that she is being looked at, on the
 condition that one does not show her that she knows" (79).
 The spectator is important, but the fact that he is
 "invisible" is even more important because she is not forced
 to recognize the fact that she is being watched or even to
 admit that she has the knowledge that she is being watched.
 Again we see that Betty's mirror image is her subject of
 certainty.

The subject of Betty's quest is so important to Eliot's depiction of egoism and vanity as it is to Lacan's theory concerning the objet a, those objects that are always escaping the subject, like Betty's count and her mirror. For as much as Betty desires her objective possessions--her earrings, her count, her good mirror, the necklace given to her by Arthur, even her gown--that hangs there just far enough away from her grasp that she cannot actually have them, all of these objects are possessions which Betty is not supposed to have. Even her quest, which is not an objective possession, is something which she is painfully aware she is not supposed to delight in. In chapter 18, for example, when Finch unexpectedly comes in her room after her self-indulgent vision of her imaginary relationship with Arthur, Betty "hastily [turned] around and [reached] the second chair in the room," (181-82) so as to avoid letting Finch know of her escapade with the mirror.

We can see again the importance which Eliot places on the issue of seeing, particularly when the designated name signifies a narcissistic flaw in the character, as we have seen earlier with the Countess Desireski and Robert Despatch. Betty herself does not name her objects herself, but the stylistic names which Eliot chooses for each of them represent the narcissistic flaw of placing too much importance on materialistic items which she sees in Betty. Betty's overwhelming emphasis on objective things inhibits

her from developing any meaningful, subjective relationships with others. By naming Betty's objects for her, Eliot is pointing out how very subjective Betty's "relationship" with her objects is and how foolish she is for not putting the same kind of effort into relationships with human beings. Eliot therefore provides commentary on this very important "relationship" Betty has with her things, a relationship which apparently affords her the kind of satisfaction which she should be receiving from her relationship with people. Her earrings then are referred to objectively as playful "baubles" (204; ch.15) and the place where she keeps them hidden away with the jacket which Arthur gave her--just as she has hidden her good mirror--is referred to as her "treasure-drawer" (205; ch.15). All of these items, so precious to Betty, are given very critical and almost flippant names by Eliot. The earrings Betty considers so lovely become toy-like "baubles," her secret hiding place for them, a child-like "treasure-drawer," and the name designated to the sum of this collection is "trinkets" (202; ch.11). All of these names much of the other insignificance which Eliot sees in these objects which have, in a sense, become Betty's best friends.

We see yet another example of Betty's reliance on objects, this time in an incident involving a personal gift given to her in secret. This particular incident raises questions concerning Betty's ability to love the giver more

than the gift or the object itself. During the dance for Arthur's birthday celebration (ch.24), Betty's reaction to her broken locket, given to her secretly by Arthur, shows her reliance on the object which represents both a gift and a symbol of devotion. As Betty places the treacherous Betty into Adam's arms, the child's hand catches the string of beads, breaks the string, and scatters the locket and beads on the floor. Betty's reaction, expressed to Adam "in a loud frightened whisper," (212; ch.24) reveals the importance of the object as well as of the giver. In fact, it is difficult to determine which is more important to Betty, the lover or the locket, for the two seem to be interlocked at this moment. Indeed, the two appear to be so interlocked that she uses both as objects. "My locket, my locket....move mind the beads," she cries (211; ch.24). Fast beyond her grasp, both physically and symbolically, the locket represents the life which Betty aspires to. Whether Betty wants the locket for romantic or sentimental reasons, or whether the locket represents yet another imaginary vision of the life she would have with Arthur, the emphasis of this interchange with Adam, a man with whom she is supposedly in love, is on the object itself.

All of these objects, then, appear as metaphors of the life with Arthur which Betty covets. Like Arthur, they are barely accessible to her and only when he needs. Yet there is a certain mystique about them: like Arthur, they

remain hidden and she indulges in them only in her privacy. By giving her such gifts, Arthur then serves for Betty as a vehicle by which she can attempt to grasp her imaginary vision. The secretive way of functioning in their actual relationship--meeting Betty secretly in the woods, giving her secret gifts which she must keep hidden, going late and coming out of hiding without anyone's recognition--readily associates the extent of the vision. The way in which his presence figures in this relationship is as elusive as the gifts, the valuable things which occasionally appear on Betty's dressing, keeping her reaching for the object or the lover himself.

Betty's emphasis upon the imaginary "relationship" with the objects around her, then, only accentuates her inability to have meaningful relationships with others, as we shall see. The last time we see her looking out of her mirror, or any mirror is in chapter 14. We see the ultimate expression of her friendship-like dependence upon it here, for, after having received a letter from Arthur Roundstone, telling her that he cannot marry her and that he must leave her, she feels that the mirror is all she has left. She knows it can no longer reflect back for her the imaginary visions she so longed for, as Arthur's departure has just destroyed them. The very nature of this important "relationship" with the mirror is critical for Betty at this juncture, for, as Eliot tells us, she has seen, at last, "the shattering of her

little dream world" (278: ch.21). Even with her swollen, red eyes, Betty still "glimpses" sight of her face in the glass" and yet now she looks on her mirror as a "companion that she might complain to--that would pity her" (278: ch.21 emphasis mine). Unable in her sorrow to desire a sympathetic, interactive sympathy with another human being, Betty seeks out the only meaningful response she knows, that is, pity--one in which she is the recipient only, and one in which no reciprocity on her part is required. Even when she recalls Finch's tendency to come to her if ever she needed a friend, she quickly dismisses the notion, knowing that Finch would not stroke her ego. "Any affection or comfort Finch could have given her would have been as indifferent to Betty this morning as everything else was except her brained painless" (281: ch.21). The mirror then serves as a pretense "companion" which will hear her complaints, which will feel for her, and which will not require her to look inward.

Just as she recognized only the "secondary bang" of her mirror dropping earlier, and not the necessity of breaking away from it completely, Betty does not, in this episode, recognize the significance of breaking away from either her mirror or her other objects which have for so long grounded her in her imaginary world. Indeed, when she does recognize that it is only the objects that have brought her happiness, she immediately abandons herself to a life of misery, far without her objects to help perpetuate her

imaginary vision, she is forced to face the reality of her lot. After the curtains were off and she awakes, according to Eliot, "she [begins] to discern the objects round her in the dim light.... There sat the carriage and the locket--the signs of all her short happiness--the signs of the life-long dreaminess that was to follow it" (379; ch.12, emphasis mine). Her objects are so significant to her that her life without them and hence without the vision they induce, would be meaningless. Yet Betty refuses to accept such a lot, and she almost immediately begins to look at the objects, which had so mysteriously belated the imaginary vision, with a nostalgic fondness.

Looking at the little trinkets which she had once eyed and fingered so greedily as the earnest of her future paradise of dincy, she lived back in the moments when they had been given to her with such tender caresses, such strangely pretty words, such glowing looks, which filled with a bewildering delicious surprise--they were no more sweetest than she had thought anything could be. (380; ch.12)

Betty then has reclaimed her imaginary vision. And even her mysterious anger with Arthur merely turns his into yet another imaginary figure when she can only perceive objectively: "The cruel, cruel Arthur who had written that letter" (380; ch.12) is "really" someone else. She now

this Arthur--the true Arthur--in yet another imaginary way, an imaginary way which best suits her present needs: so is someone else--not the fine gentleman who gave her great finery. She does not hate Arthur; in fact, she adores to the man who broke her heart so surely "the writer of that letter." "She hated the writer of that letter--hated him for the very reason that she hung upon him all her love" (194v ch.11). Having reinscribed Arthur's identity by making him into yet another imaginary figure, Betty creates one more literary image.

This time the literary image is of herself, and involves a man, who, unlike Arthur, is very much accessible to her; that is, Adam Bede. Betty's desire to elicit Adam's attention, I believe, is grounded in her concern about other people's perception of her as an uneducated, pregnant young woman. I also think that she uses Adam's attentions and pretends to return his love in order to buy time so that she can continue to sustain her imaginary vision of Arthur. In her dealings with Adam, the only man who truly loves her (yet he loves her in his own imaginary way, which will be discussed in the next section), we see that Betty's concern for others is rooted only in the way in which they perceive her. Betty is utterly unable to recognize othersness, for she sees her relationship with others only in the way in which it reflects back on her.

Next I look at how Betty's actions as literary and

realization of otherness, in a way which is parallel to Lenin, can be seen in chapter 17, "In Which the Story Reaches a Little." In the following passage, which ends the chapter, and is also, I suspect, a preface to the very next chapter, in which we see Betty's self-discovered epiphany at its height, Eliot describes the weaknessness of those who search for the illusory ideal and who lose the much more beautiful experience of appreciating their fellow men. The story, using the voice of the narrator, that our daily, ordinary relationships with our friends is seen as a weakness by those (like Betty) who look for the ideal. Familiar, comfortable, sympathetic relationships are despised by

that lofty order of minds who pass after the ideal, and are opposed by a general sense that their emotions are of too sanguine a character to find fit objects among their everyday fellow men. . . . I have often been favored with the confidence of these select natures, and find them concur in the experience that great men are near-estimated and small men are inappreciable . . . of an afraid I have often smiled with hypocritical assent, and quitted them with an apoplexy on the fleeting nature of our illusions. (129; 88-17)

These illusions, then, include the one who reaches for the unattainably ideal from experiencing any kind of otherness

because in the process of reaching for the ideal, the ordinary, the "conscienceless," and the "vulgar," with all of their significance, are overlooked and ignored.

I have come to the conclusion that human nature is human--the way I have learnt something of the deep pathos, the subtle mysteries--has been by living a great deal among people more or less conscienceless and vulgar, of whom you would perhaps hear nothing very surprising if you were to inquire about them in the neighborhoods where they dwell.... I have observed this remarkable coincidence that the select natures who part after the ideal, and find nothing in particular or pettiness great enough to content their reverence and love, are curiously in union with the narrowest and pettiest. (135; ch.17)

This passage ends the chapter and significantly chapter 18 depicts the human experience which requires, perhaps above all other experiences, the most sincere form of sympathy--a funeral. Miss Beldie has drowned, and the chapter opens immediately with Mrs. Rogers, waiting for Betty in "her plain dress and shawl" (211; ch.17), and shielding her husband's attention to her efforts in holding up the family's arrival at the funeral.

"Betty, Betty, don't you know church begins at

too, and it's gone half after one o'clock? Now
 you get nothing better to think on this good
 Sunday, as Thine Bed's to be put into the
 ground, and him drowned in the dead o' the
 night, as it's enough to make one's back run
 cold, but you must be 'disengaging yourself as if
 there was a wedding l'oked of a funeral?'. (211;
 ch.17)

Mrs Poyser recognizes Betty's vice: the result of her
 egoistic self image is her inability to appreciate others' *misery*.
 Even her choice of dress represents her
 thoughtless insensitivity to the feelings of others, for at a
 funeral, the feelings of others are regarded above all
 others'. "Her hat was trimmed with pink, and her frock had
 pink spots sprinkled on a white ground. There was nothing
 but pink and white about her" (211). This pink vision of
 levity is significantly contrasted to Mrs Poyser's
 "plain bonnet and shawl" and Mr Poyser's "funny suit of
 drab," (211) both more appropriate and thoughtful choices of
 attire. And Eliza reveals the way in which this same
 emphasis upon her physical appearance interferes with her
 recognition of someone else's grief, when in Chapter 8, Mrs
 Poyser and Eliza must point out to her first, that there has
 been a death in the Bedd family, and secondly, that the
 drowned person is John's father, not John himself. Because
 Betty was so involved with her mirror and her mirror image

only moments before the news was brought to the Hall Port, she misinterpreted the information. Now Popper again points out this flaw. "Adam Bede and all his kin might be deceived for what you'd say--you'd be parking at the glass the next minute" (148) ch.9).

With Ellen's detailed depiction of the scenes of sympathy which the Bedes' fellow-parishioners show at the funeral, she reveals Betty as a figure who is so self-involved that the sorrow that she does manage to express comes only from her disappointment that Arthur is not at the funeral. We see first her total preoccupation with the hope that Arthur will at least make an appearance. "Betty.... was absorbed in the thought that Arthur somewhere would soon be coming into church, for the marriage must surely be at the church gate by this time" (242) ch.14). After a long series of inquisitory screams for his absence, the reality that he will not be in her presence that day, will not see her in her pretty pink dress, comes over her, and the weeping begins. "The chill disappointment was too hard to bear; she felt herself turning pale, her lips trembling; she was ready to cry" (243). Furthermore, Betty's opinion is so great that she automatically assumes that everyone will know the reason why she is weeping. Her concern then is that her tears will surely be perceived as what they really are: disappointment over her lover's absence. "Oh, what good she did! everybody would know the

reason: they would know she was crying because RICHIE was not there... And Mr. Cuddy... was staring at her, she knew" (142-44). She also gives no thought to the notion that tears represent sorrow for another at a funeral. And that is exactly how the "good-natured Betty" perceives them, for she sees "two great drops" fall down Betty's face and immediately offers her a bottle of smelling-salts, wrongly assuming that Betty is faint from her grief over Thine's death. As Elinor tells us, "Betty [was] unable to imagine any cause for tears in church except sickness" (144). Betty then is not only unable to appreciate and participate in the grief over the loss of another human being, she is also unable to appreciate or accept the comfort offered to her by a fellow-griever. Her only concern then for the other is that he or she will spoil the ideal image she has of herself; she can tolerate herself as being perceived by others only in an admirable way.

Betty [wipes] away the traces of her tears, and [tries] with all her might not to shed any more. Betty had a certain strength in her vain little nature; she would have borne anything rather than be laughed at or grieved at with any other feeling than admiration; she would have pressed her own nails into her tender flesh rather than people should know a secret she did not wish them to know. (144)

As we saw Eliza offer Betty ample opportunities to express at the very least a recognition of the ethics around her, the image which she leaves us of Betty at the funeral is one of a little girl, faintly dressed in her best pink frock, and sobbing over the disappointing realization that her own self-created vision has not become, even momentarily, a reality.

Yet as we have seen before, Betty manages to keep her imaginary vision of Arthur alive by some mental process of rationalisation. It is upon, however, this time that wine set over her disappointment, though her disappointment has fostered conjectures which "[accounted] for Arthur's absence on the supposition that he really wanted to come, really wanted to see her again," for this time she felt that "she would like him to suffer too" (ch.14).

But even with this apparently healthy form of anger towards Arthur, Betty manages to maintain her imaginary vision of her life with him by falsely claiming her love for him. She creates the illusion that she loves Arthur, even after she has received Arthur's letter (ch.18) saying that he must leave her. Alone in her bed-chamber (ch.21), Betty decides that she must do something to appease the disappointment of Arthur's leave taking, and her choice is to marry Adam.

The possibility of marrying Adam appeared to her in a new light. In a mind where no strong

appetites are at work, where there is no supreme sense of right to which the agitated nature can cling and steady itself in quiet endurance, one of the first results of sorrow is a desperate vague clenching after any deed that will change the actual condition. (268; ch.12)

Ellet shows us then how Betty's decision to accept Adam's love is one of convenience. First, it will alleviate the dread and shame of having to try to exist as an unwed mother and the engagement itself will also enable her to live comfortably until Arthur's return, which she is convinced will happen.

Why should she not marry Adam? She did not care what she did, so that it made some change in her life. She felt confident that he would still wish to marry her, and any further thought about Adam's happiness in the matter had never yet visited her. (268; ch.12)

Again, she rationalizes her decision in order to perpetuate her imaginary vision. Indeed, the "vision" of the life which Adam can offer her is made quite clear and is presented to her as quite within her grasp by her uncle, who sees a marriage to Adam as quite an honor. "If you can catch Adam for a husband, Betty, you'll ride it' your own spring-cart some day" (278; ch.14). Betty's own explanations, however, are not at all in line with the

aspirations she has for herself, and with the loss of her head, she quickly dismisses this vision as almost unobtainable. "To ride in a spring cart seemed a very desirable lot indeed to her now" (279; ch.18).

Unable to keep up the illusion that she loves Adam, a few months before the wedding, Betty chooses to leave Bayliffe--and Adam--rather than go on living with her "hidden dread." And even though her vision of her life with Arthur no longer promises happiness for her, for "he would do nothing that would satisfy or soothe her pride," Betty still chooses to seek him out rather than "quit" in that she calls "this blind trust" of marriage to Adam (313; ch.19). Her quest for Arthur, I believe, is now grounded in yet another, though different imaginary vision she creates for herself. She believes that Arthur will protect her, and that, for Betty, is the best of all possible evils. When she decides to leave Adam, she thinks to herself: "Arthur was at Windsor; he would surely not be angry with her. If he did not mind about her as he used to do, he had promised to be good to her" (313; ch.19). Even in this, we see Betty grasping for the imaginary "goodness" or ability she sees in Arthur, for that is all she has left.

As a result of dismissing Adam, who truly loves her and wishes to take care of her, Betty ironically does achieve her goal of meeting with Arthur. Eliot makes this encounter as much like a fantasy as Betty has made her

fantasy-like vision of her life with him all along. It is only in a last-minute delivery of a reprieve which saves her from a death sentence, a result of her murdering her child, that Arthur figures again in Betty's life. His almost remarkable, triumphant entrance, with a piece of paper which will save her life, only minutes before she is to be hanged, is his last and only gesture of love or affection towards her. This fantasy-like encounter is almost indicative of the imaginary, fantasy-like vision of the life with Arthur which Betty has attempted to attain. What then offers Betty what she has wanted all along, and shows that her imaginary vision, and the way in which she has excluded all forms of representation which would result in subjective, interactive relationships with others, brought her only an empty, momentary, basically meaningless break with that very vision.

Recognizing Sympathy: Adam Bede's Discovery of Sympathy

Betty Surfel is the only character in Eliot's Adam Bede who is unable to recognize sympathy, though she is, like Anne Westro, the Countess Cuthbert, and Robert Donipster, a character who regularly never achieves sympathy, or for that matter, experiences the joy which comes from the sharing of human emotion. As we shall see, Adam Bede himself has difficulty experiencing true sympathetic feeling, because he is caught in an illusory vision that tells him that his relationship with Betty is a

truly loving one, that one truly can return his love, indeed, that she can even feel sympathetically with him.

Adam sees Betty in several illusory ways, making her his subject of certainty, and mistakenly comprehending his relationship with her as a truly sympathetic one. In a very egotistic way, he sees himself as the only man who is "right" for Betty, for he will go to any length to interpret Betty's glances and gestures as expressions of feeling for him. And determined not to see how others have been affected by Betty's selfish conduct, even after she has caused her own ruin, Adam creates imaginary motives for her behavior. Because I claim that Adam refuses to recognize Betty's egotistic lack of otherness, and because he creates his own illusory visions about the possibility of his own future with her, it is necessary to explore his own struggles with interactive sympathy. We can perhaps understand his difficulty he has experiencing sympathetic otherness by examining him as a Lamanian subject of certainty, who overcomes otherness because he is seeking out that which is whole and unified. We shall see how Adam in the first chapters is a man who imposes his reality on others and who is unable to feel enough sympathy for those who do not meet his high standards of moral conduct. Finally, we shall see how his desire for wholeness and unity contributes to his perception of Betty and Betty's relationship with Arthur Roundthorne unsympathetically and in an illusory way, for

Adam attempts to impose his authority upon the relationship, and define it in the way which he sees fit.

First recognizes this weakness in Adam's nature—that is, of authoritarianism imposing his reality on others—and early in the novel points to his reliance upon what John Salparris calls his "doctrine of work" (128) as its source. Indeed, we see in the very first chapter his dependence on his own definition of a work ethic, a work ethic which has the object of completeness as its foundation. Adam is frustrated with his fellow workers then because they all end their day in the middle of their work.

Ready Jim had tossed his phone and was reaching
his jacket; Wory Ben had left a screw half
driven in, and thrown his screw-driver into
his tool-basket; Wue-Tert, who, true to his
name, had kept silence throughout the previous
conversation, had hung down his hammer as he
was in the act of lifting it. (24) (St.) emphatic
since;

Because they have only partially completed their work, Adam is angered, considering a job that is only half done a poor reflection on the state of the men's moral character. His comments then reflect not only his subjective judgement upon the incomplete state of their work, but also reflect his personal judgement of their moral character, and the way in which he imposes his own definition of moral character

upon them. Adam's following comment suggests that any man who does not enjoy his work (as Adam surely does), is immediately considered lazy and unworthy of doing the work in the first place. "I can't abide to see men throw away their tools i' that way, as if they took no pleasure i' their work, and was afraid o' doing a stroke too much" (35). Adam continues the discussion about work with Mary when she "[kisses] play rather my work" (36; ch.1), and in a judgmental way, comments a second time on the way in which leaving work early, (according to Adam's concept of the work ethic), is a poor reflection not only on the man's attitude toward his work, but on his very character. "I hate to see a man's arm drop down as if he was shot, before the clock's barely struck, just as if he'd never a bit o' pride and delight in's work" (36; ch.1). If these men do not conform to Adam's definition of the work ethic then, they are, (according to Adam), not worthy of the work itself, nor of enjoying any self esteem they might derive from doing a job in any way which they see as most satisfactory.

Adam's tendency to judge those who do not conform to his definition of morality also extends to his own father, Thomas Rade and we can see that much of this intolerance also stems from his insistence upon this work ethic. His pride about his work and the way in which others may perceive any accomplished work that comes from the father-and-son workshop is reflected in this interchange with his mother concerning

Thier' absence. Here, he implies that his father's neglect of his work is no worse than pure deceit since a finished coffin—a completed job—has been promised to the Thier family. In this discourse with his mother, Adam immediately reminds her of the responsibility of finishing the job—a responsibility which is now his because of his father's neglect. And Adam feels that this is a responsibility which he must carry out because he will not "deceive" people by breaking promises concerning a completed job.

What signifies how long it takes us? Isn't the coffin promised? Can they bury the man without a coffin? I'd work my right hand off sooner than deceive people with lies I' that way. It makes us had to think on 't. (10; 28-8)

Again we see Adam's insistence upon automatically assigning poor moral qualities to the worker whose job is only partially completed.

During this same interchange with his mother, we also see that Adam's sense of responsibility concerning the completion of jobs at the workshop greatly affects his ability to feel sympathy with his father. When Litchik, for example points out that "there 't no account wi' thy father, none can w' anybody else," (10; 28-8) Adam again takes the stance of the subject of certainty who defines, even for his father, exactly what morality is. "If I weren't along with him, he'd sell every bit o' stuff in' th' yard, and spend it

on drink. I know there's a duty to be done by my father, but it isn't my duty to encourage him in running headlong to ruin" (84). Again we see how Adam's notions of morality are imposed upon even his father.

Yet Eliot also shows how these imposed notions keep Adam from experiencing any kind of father-soning with him, and after Wilam has died, Adam sorrowfully recognizes this failure. It is important to note Adam's awareness of his wrongdoing in treating his father with such a critical and stringent sense of morality, which, in essence, excludes kindness, love, and respect, which for Eliot are essential for a mutually interactive and sympathetic relationship.

'Ah, I was too hard,' Adam said to himself.

'It's a sore fault in me as it's so hot and out o' patience with people when they do wrong, and my heart gets shut up against 'em, so as I can't bring myself to forgive 'em. I was close enough there's sure pains my loss in my soul, for I could almost make a thousand strokes with th' hammer for my father than bring myself to say a kind word to him.' (87; ch.12)

Adam's recognition of his innate weakness and the time at which he recognizes it reminds us of the sorrowful Rose Barren who also recognizes only upon her death—that he has neglected Billy's needs of tenderness and love—that he did

not participate in and share with both her mother and her
 joys. Nevertheless, Eliot does offer Adam a second chance,
 unlike Adam whose story ends at the very point which he has
 made this discovery.

Indeed, Eliot shows that Adam is subject to change and
 self discovery throughout the novel, and the self discovery
 he makes concerning his failed relationship with his father
 is only a prelude to the discovery he will make concerning
 his illicitory perceptions of Betty. After the funeral, Adam
 is able to point to the specific aspect of his failed
 sympathy, which is that he is unable to sympathetically feel
 with those people around him whom he considers weaker than
 himself. He is critical--in a self-imposing way-- of both
 those who work in his carpentry shop and his own father
 because he is unable to sympathetically recognize that some
 of the very "weaknesses" they have are weaknesses only in
 contrast with his his unique strengths. Adam enjoys his
 work, takes pride in it, and delights in a completed job,
 yet he is unable to recognize that those aspects which form
 his make-up are not necessarily the same aspects which form
 the makeup of others. In fact, he does not recognize that
 the way in which he perceives his work, which is the way he
 wants all around him to perceive their work, is only one
 part of Adam's life. In the following passage, Eliot points
 out Adam's own recognition of this flaw, the result of which
 is a lack of sympathy or "fellow feeling" with those around

him who do not share the same strength of character that he does.

Perhaps there lay the hardness he had accused himself of: he had been falling-falling with the weakness that goes in spite of fore-man consequences. Without this falling-falling, how can we be get enough patience and charity towards our stumbling, falling companions in the long and chequered journey? (and oh, to express this)

It is Adam's privilege then to enjoy this ability to practice moral fortitude; nevertheless, Eliot points out that it is his responsibility to sympathize with, not criticize or attempt to correct those whose moral characters are weaker. This inability to sympathize with the morally weak then is, for Eliot, a moral weakness in and of itself.

And there is but one way in which a strong detached soul can learn it--by getting his heart-wirings bound round the weak and aching, so that he must share not only the outward consequences of their error, but their inward suffering. This is a long and hard lesson, and Adam had at present only learned the alphabet of it in his father's sudden death, which, by annihilating in an instant all that had constituted his indignation, had sent a sudden rush of thought

and memory over what had claimed his pity and tenderness. (100-101; CR.18)

With his father's death then John recognizes that he does have a propensity to be over-critical of those who are morally weak-according to his own definition of moral weakness.

Eliot has shown us a very similar weakness, as we have seen, in Anne Barton, who is unable to feel sympathy with anyone, or to even recognize this very weakness in himself, until Billy has died. The way in which Eliot reveals Anne Barton's weakness, nevertheless, produces a character who, in the end, is much more aware of this weakness. Though she does not complete Anne Barton's story of the painful discovery sympathy, Eliot does allow us to see Anne's discovery of his weakness due first of all to his realization that he must be more sympathetically aware of those who are weaker, morally weaker, than himself, and secondly, due to his painful realization that he has perceived Betty, all along, in an illusory way. His sympathetic awareness of Betty stems from his initial discovery that he lacks sympathy with and tolerance of the morally weak. Nevertheless, what he believes is a sympathetically interactive relationship with Betty turns into a relationship based only upon a purely illusory tolerance of Betty's equidistant flow. Through a painful discovery that this relationship with Betty is illusory,

that he has used her as his subject of certainty as much as she has used him to help perpetuate her own imaginary vision. Adam, by the end of the novel, learns that he has neglected opportunities to build meaningful relationships.

His weakness stems from his inability to recognize--properly--the validity of the moral weaknesses of others around him. He can therefore recognize Betty's moral weakness because he is caught up in the imaginary vision that she is a complete, unified specimen of "wholeness;" she "fits into" his definition of wife and he will do anything to avoid spoiling that definition. His false notions that her acceptance of her class, her modesty concerning her beauty, and her ability to share parts of herself with others (experience sympathy) make Adam a subject of certainty because he is placing upon her a definition of a morality that she simply does not possess. As we shall see, even when Betty is exposed as a woman who had quickly lied about her love for Adam when she had truly loved Arthur Bernickson, he still clings to his illusory definition of her. And by defending her in this imaginary way, Adam also excludes the possibility of enjoying meaningful relationships with others.

As a result of his father's death, then, Adam recognizes his inability to sympathize with those "others" who are morally weaker than himself. He chooses to practice his newly found understanding of sympathy upon Betty herself,

and unlike others, particularly the Foresters, who recognize her spiritual nature, Adam extends his new sympathetic tolerance to her alone. Furthermore, this new found tolerance merely becomes Adam's illusory perception of sympathy, that is, he truly sees Betty as responding to his sorrow in a reciprocal, truly sympathetic way. Significantly, and perhaps ironically, the first example of Adam's illusory perception of Betty occurs upon the death of his father, for this is the very time at which Adam chooses to exercise his own new perception of sympathy. His mistaken perception that Betty is truly capable of feeling sympathy with him and his family comes even before the fearful scene at the funeral. Though he knows it can only be a "Foolish Thought" (141; ch.12) that Betty would be coming to his home to express her condolences, his thoughts still immediately turn to her as he hears footsteps approaching the door. "A foolish thought came, and moved him strangely. As if it could be Betty!" (141). That he wants to believe it is her is seen in his conflict: his reason tells him she could be "the last person likely to be in the house" and yet he reveals his illusory perception of her--that is, that she would feel sympathy for the family--and thus keeps it alive by delaying the inevitable entrance. "He felt reluctant to go and look, and have the clear proof that it was some one else" (142). During the delay, then, Adam chooses to focus on his imaginary vision

of Betty, one in which both her physical loveliness and her
 imagined capacity for sympathy are intertwined. "Adam's
 imagination saw a disfigured face, with dark bright eyes and
 regular smiles looking backwards at the back, and a rounded
 figure (not lacking a little to stamp the female)" (281).
 This imaginary vision is two-fold in that he can actually
 imagine the epileptic Betty, involved with her hair brush,
 extending her sympathy towards his family's loss and that he
 truly sees Betty's physical beauty only in light of her
 moral beauty.

What occurs at Helen's funeral, I suggest, is a result
 of both Betty's own self involved concern for herself only
 (she is crying because Arthur is not at the funeral to see
her) and Adam's illusory belief that Betty cares for his
 family's sorrow. Though others attending the funeral
 tearfully express their sorrow for the Edmuds' loss, Adam
 interprets Betty's tears and sorrowful expression as genuine
 sympathy for his family. At work the next day he recalls
 Betty's expression of sorrow.

He thought, yesterday, when he put out his hand
 to her as they came out of church, that there
 was a touch of angelically fineness in her face,
 such as he had not seen before, and he took it
as a sign that she had some sympathy with his
family sorrow (284; *emphasis mine*).

While Betty's tears are not genuine--(in fact, we have seen

that she is so self involved that she automatically assumes people will interpret them for what they see: tears of disappointment for Arthur's non-appearance)--Adam's very perception of the tears representing apathetic feeling with his sorrow is just as unperceived, for he sees Betty's behavior only in the way he wishes her to behave. Eliot shows, then, in this particular episode, the tragic flaw of seeing another as imaginarily whole. In this one scene, the imaginary paraphernalia of otherness explodes, as neither Betty nor Adam are even close to understanding how others are perceiving them. Betty's tears have nothing to do with her sorrow for the Helen's loss, as Adam wrongly perceives, and the funeral-goers have no idea that Betty, as she wrongly perceives, knew that she is crying over Arthur. Betty, Betty and Adam are at cross purposes here due to their illusions. Betty's sorrow is expressed as a result of her broken imaginary vision, while Adam interprets Betty's every glance as imaginarily supporting his perception of the way she must or should feel for him.

We can see yet another way in which Adam perceives Betty's supposed love for him in an illusory way, for he consistently shows his loving tolerance of Betty by making excuses for the way she neglects him. Ironically, Adam's excuses for Betty's neglect turn out to be opportunities for her to perpetuate her imaginary love for Arthur, as we shall see. Eliot's narrator sets the tone for Adam's behavior

torments Betty during the time when she treats him poorly. In this example, the narrator both recognizes that the way he excuses her shows his illusory vision of her and also reveals that he understands why Adam would create such an illusion. "If ever she behaved with cold vanity towards him, he said to himself, it is only because she doesn't love me well enough and he was sure that love, whatever she gave it, would be the most precious thing a man could possess on earth" (106; *emphatic mine*). Eliot's narrator, perhaps due to his masculine affinity with Adam, recognizes the poor way which Adam is being treated by Betty. Furthermore, he recognizes the almost Machian aspect of Adam's behavior, for he points out that even though Adam knows nothing about Betty's true intentions, he is quite happy to enjoy the illusion: "It was a very old story; but Adam knew nothing about it, so he drank in the sweet delusion" (*emphatic mine* 107; *emphatic*). This narrative comment suggests that had Adam known Betty's true intentions, he still would delight in the illusion that Betty's love is sincere. And this is exactly what he does, as we shall see.

We also see Adam himself making lengthy excuses or rationalizing Betty's behavior by reading into it what he likes. One day as they gather warrens together at the Hall Farm, we hear Adam thinking to himself through the narrator, who understands his excuses for pretense: "She was not

indifferent to his presence after all: she had blushed when she saw him, and then there was that look of sadness about her which must surely mean love, since it was the opposite of her usual manner, which had often depressed him as "indifference" (281; ch.18). And even when Betty accidentally reveals that she has a secret lover, Adam still continues to make excuses for her. We see this in his reaction to Betty's grabbing her locket which has fallen from her neck at Arthur's birthday dance. Though Adam is at first alarmed that the locket signifies that she has a secret lover, and a secret lover whom he believes he should know about, he still formulates excuses to perpetuate his illusion of Betty's devotion to him alone. Upon seeing the necklace and recognizing Betty's secretive reaction that it remains hidden, Adam thinks to himself:

Had Betty a lover he didn't know of?--for none of her relations, he was sure, would give her a locket like that; and none of her admirers, with whom he was acquainted, was in the position of an accepted lover, as the giver of that locket must be. And was lost in the other impossibility of finding any person for his fears to slight so. (281; ch.18 emphasis mine).

This last sentence indicates Adam's own need to keep his illusion of Betty alive. In it we see his other desire that the possibility that a lover exists is a real one because he

cannot come up with a rational alternative which would account for Betty's leaving the necklace.

Alan leaves the dance, sure that Betty has a secret lover of whom he knows nothing. During his walk home, he creates for himself a multitude of imaginary excuses or reasons as to why or how Betty could use such a fine piece of jewelry without having received it from a lover. With every fearful question, Alan creates an answer, even for his own valid questions. The following "imaginary arguments," which attempt to support Betty's seemingly questionable behavior reveal again his imaginary perception of Betty.

Betty, found of finery as she was, might have bought the thing herself. It looked too expensive for that—it looked like the things on white satin at the jeweller's shop at Rochester. But Alan had very imperfect notions of the value of such things, and he thought it certainly could not cost more than a guinea. Perhaps Betty had had as much as that in Christmas-money, and there was no knowing but she might have been childish enough to spend it in that way; she was such a young thing, and she couldn't help loving finery! But then, why had she been so frightened about it at first, and changed colour so, and afterwards pretended not to care? O, that was because she was ashamed of his seeing that she had such a

such thing--she was conscious that it was wrong for her to spend her money on it, and she knew that Adam disapproved of finery. It was a proof that she cared about what he liked and disliked.

[118; ch.18]

Not only do we see Adam's many imaginary excuses for Betty's behavior here, but we also see how he, in an imaginary way, perceives her as being aware of his own likes and dislikes, and that he truly believes that she is aware of his stance in the relationship. His excuses then are even more imaginary because they suit only his own definition of what the relationship should be, ideally. Furthermore, Eliza recognizes the way in which Adam keeps his illusion of Betty alive, for she points out that in a "dream," these mistaken notions, which coldly question Betty's sincerity, are forgiven.

And so Adam went to bed comforted, having woven for himself an imaginary web of probabilities--the sweetest screen a man can place between himself and the truth. His last waking thoughts rolled into a dream that he was with Betty again at the Ball Room, and that he was asking her to forgive his not being so cold and silent. [119; ch.18]

The fact that Betty would have to "forgive" him also reveals that Adam must even his own need to question the illusion as a type of sin.

Even after it is quite apparent that Betty no longer loves him, after she has run away, just before their wedding is to take place, Adam is still unable to see Betty in any other way but innocent. He again goes to great lengths to find excuses for her deserting him. For example, after he has discovered that she never arrived at Inverfield as she was supposed to, Adam again creates imaginary excuses for her. And I think that these excuses only help Adam to feel that he has a sense of sympathy for someone who is weaker than himself. There is never a sense that he genuinely feels with Betty or is attempting to sympathetically understand her weakness. Indeed, in the following passage, we see that he must "ward off" the thought that Arthur has anything to do with her departure by finding other, more acceptably pleasing reasons that Betty would cross with him to him, and so soon before their marriage.

The thought of Arthur had darted through Adam like a sharp pang, but he tried for some time to ward off its return by busy[ing] himself with spec[ulations] of accounting for the alarming fact, which struck him with incredible shock. Some accident had happened. Betty had, by some strange chance, got into a wrong vehicle at Oakbourne; she had taken ill, and ~~she~~ had been so frightened when by telling them so. (441; ch.38 emphasis mine)

As we have seen his do before, Adam even endows Betty with sympathetic qualities which she simply does not possess. Adam's perception of her here is very imaginary and only helps him feel better about his devotion to her.

Still clinging to this imaginary vision of Betty, Adam attempts to and fails miserably at sympathetically tolerating Betty's behavior because he uses the same imaginary vision to avoid perceiving Betty as what she has publicly become--a criminal, therefore placing the faulting of upon on himself alone. And while Adam fools himself into believing that he is sympathetically sharing Betty's suffering, we shall see that what he is truly doing is expressing the disappointment he feels over having lost his beautiful imaginary vision. The examples of Adam's behavior in this section of the novel are what reveal him as egotistically stalling pity for his own grief while presenting himself as truly concerned for Betty. The following passages reveal the sorrow Adam is experiencing, not for Betty's sake, but for the disappointing, broken situation, or illusion of a life with her that will now never be a reality. Alone with Mr Irvine before the trial, Adam cries, "I can't bear it...O God, it's hard to lay upon us-- it's too hard to think she's wicked" (155; ch.18 emphasis mine). Adam's thoughts are not upon Betty, sitting alone in prison, but are instead upon himself, and the lost vision of Betty which he will never be able to regain. And in

Chapter 31, when Mr. Ineson attempts to convince Adam that vengeance against Arthur will not benefit Betty. Adam expresses what is most painful to him in all this, that is, that the lovely illusion of her is broken for him forever. "That's the deepest curse of all...that's what makes the bitterness of it...it can never be undone. My poor Betty...she can never be my own Betty again...the grabbliest thing I did had somehow swelling up at me... I thought she loved me...and was good" (with oh it explains mine). And in all of this agony, Adam never considers how Betty's life will forever be marred and how that mark upon her, even if she escapes the gallows, will forever prevent her from experiencing a truly meaningful and happy life. What is worse is that he attempts to disguise what his pure and utter self disillusion and believes that it is true sympathetic feeling with Betty.

The last time we see Adam's agonistic expression of concern for Betty is during the scene at the trial when the verdict of guilty is pronounced upon Betty. Adam immediately reverts to his usual technique of making excuses for Betty's behavior.

Betty could not be guilty of the crime--her heart must have clung to the baby--also why should she have taken it with her? She might have left it behind. The little creature had died naturally, and then she had hidden its hidden were as little

to death. (179; 08.43)

And this time Eliot's own commentary upon Adam's behavior reflects the alignment of these characters' weaknesses with Lacanian theory. Eliot refers to Adam's excuses for Betty this time as "imaginary arguments" (179; 08.43 emphasis mine). Though her terminology of course refers to the actual imagination, and is not used in the way Lacan would later use the term "imaginary," we again see that the similarity between Eliot's and Lacan's perception of subjectivity is striking.

I will discuss one final illusion which I see as not only hindering Adam's relationship with Betty but also as a way of negotiating truly apocalyptic relationships with others, some of which are already in the making. Adam, I believe, creates the illusion that he can "save" Betty from a bad and improper relationship with Arthur Bennithorne. In this creates yet another illusory vision of Betty, I claim, by assuming that she wants or needs to be saved from this relationship which, he believes, will only pull her down. His perception of Arthur then is just as illusory as his perception of Betty, yet in a different way. As with his father, Adam is unable to tolerate what he believes are Arthur's moral weaknesses while he can fully tolerate Betty's weaknesses by assuming them to meet his own apocalyptic ends. In fact, Adam, I claim, may be considered a subject of curiosity in his dealings with Arthur after he has

assured himself that Arthur is solely responsible for Betty's crisis. When he learns that Arthur is the lover who has been secretly meeting with Betty, he imposes his certainty upon Arthur by telling him, instructing him how to act. Out of an imaginary belief that he can make Arthur recognize that he is deceiving Betty by allowing her to believe that a life with his--her imaginary victim--is indeed possible, he forces him to behave the way he thinks Arthur must behave. In the following passage, he has that Adam pompously assumes that he knows how Betty feels about Arthur, and even claims that he is speaking for her.

You're sitting with your eyes open, whatever you say do; but how do you know what's been in her mind? She's all but a child--as any man with a conscience ought to feel bound to take care of. And whatever you say think, I know you're detached her mind. I know she's been fixing her heart on you...but you seem to make light of what she may feel (181v ok, it's emphatic mind).

By arguing that Arthur does not know what Betty feels, then, he is at the same time pompously claiming that he must know. He therefore is speaking for her, as he says outright, and by forcefully suggesting that Arthur write her letter explaining that he cannot continue their relationship, he is, in essence, speaking for Arthur as well. Therefore, the letter itself is not genuine: indeed, Arthur writes in a

note attached to the final copy of the letter: "I have written everything you wish." (194: ch.19) which indeed indicates that these are not Arthur's words at all. We see Adam's illusory belief that he is doing right to Betty in the following passage:

I'm not speaking for myself, but for her. I ask you t' undertake her before you go away for ever; and if you leave her behind with a notion in her head o' your feeling about her like mine, as she feels about you, and the mischief may get worse. It may be a smart for her now, b' '12 save her pain i' th' end. I ask you to write a letter....tell her the truth, and take blame to yourself for behaving as you'd no right to do to a young woman as isn't your equal. (194: ch.14)

Adam instructs Arthur of his duty then and acts as an instructional manual of sorts on gentlemanly behavior.

Not only is Adam imposing his reality on certainty upon Arthur by asking him write this letter to Betty, by trying to make him feel the way he believes he should feel, but he is also dismissing Betty by assuming that he can simply feel for her. He is dismissing the validity of her feelings by forcing Arthur to express something which Arthur does not feel: this letter contains, pure and simple, the feelings Adam believes Arthur should have, and not at all the feelings which Arthur does have for Betty. Adam

therefore is focusing certainty upon both Arthur and Betty by making each feel the way he wishes them to feel. His intentions for having Arthur write the letter, I claim, are only veiled by his outward expression that the letter will be for Betty's "good." What Adam truly wants is his original imaginary vision that Betty loves him, and with Arthur in the way, he cannot complete this vision. Focusing the blame solely on Arthur then, helps Adam to continue his illusion concerning Betty's "fierce" character. This also creates for him the egoistic and imaginary notion that he is somehow "saving" Betty from the evil Arthur.

Arthur Donalson is a character, who, according to Adam's moral standards, is undeniably weaker than he "should" be. As we have seen, when Arthur does not behave the way he (Adam) believes a gentleman should, he gives him a set of his own rules by which to play. As with his father, he is unable to sympathetically understand and tolerate those who are morally weaker than himself. Though he recognizes this weakness once, upon his father's death, and attempts to rectify it, he attempts to feel sympathy only with Betty, and even this becomes an imaginary sense of sympathy, as we have seen, because Adam consistently accuses Betty based on the belief that these accusations are sympathetic feeling. Nevertheless, Eliot offers Adam yet one more chance to discover true sympathy. Mr. Irvine recognizes that Adam is misinterpreting sympathy and suggesting them around

him who truly feel sympathy with him. It is because of this realization that Adam Bede becomes Eliot's one hero of the early fiction who, though stumbling with false ideas concerning sympathy, does finally achieve a true understanding of it.

As Mr Irwine is the instrument by which Eliot teaches Adam to properly understand sympathy, let us first look at the way in which he responsively expresses the almost fellow feeling with Adam that he can. Eliot does not call this interaction "sympathy," but instead chooses to refer to it as "pity," though I claim that it is not a pity that diminishes the dignity of the other, as we have seen earlier. It is instead an expression of fellow feeling which has attached to it a sense of helplessness; that is, Mr Irwine knows that Adam is, at this juncture, incapable of offering any feeling in return. In fact, Eliot appears to recognize that he is uncomfortable with expressing pity, for she describes "Mr Irwine's... pity" as "hesitating" and "whining" (181; ch.24). In the following passage, we can see that he recognizes Adam's sensitivity to Betty's plight and that the news that he must deliver to him that she is in jail, accused of child murder, can only be understood as even more grief which he must "distill" (183) on Adam. The narrative says of Mr Irwine's feelings:

But every other feeling as it rushed upon him was
 turned into abeyance by pity, deep respectful

pity, for the man who sat before him, — already as husband, going forth with and killed
 resignation to an awful sorrow, while a real one
 was close upon him, too far beyond the range of
 common trial for him ever to have faced it. His
 own agitation was quelled by a certain awe that
 comes over us in the presence of a great anguish:
 for the anguish which he had inflicted on Adam was
 already present to him. (431)

Furthermore, Eliot conveys in this passage the sense that Mr
 Irwin does understand, to the extent that it is possible
 for him to understand, Adam's sorrow as well as the pain
 that lies even still before him. We also see Mr Irwin's
 recognition that Adam's sorrow is so far beyond his ability
 to understand it that he feels it would be pretensions of
 him to say that he does. We may also note that Eliot
 himself is expressing sympathy with Mr Irwin, who has the
 very difficult job of inflicting painful news upon someone
 who is already experiencing emotional pain.¹ She then
 recognizes, sympathetically, the difficult task of
 expressing sympathy when the pain the other is experiencing
 is simply overwhelming. During Mr Irwin's interchange with
 Adam, she recognizes and acknowledges his difficult task.
 "The sight of this strong fine man shattered by the
 invisible stroke of sorrow, moved him so deeply that speech
 was not easy" (435). Eliot presents Mr Irwin then as both

one who respects the other's feelings enough that he does not, like Adam himself, second guess his or her feelings, and also as the one who can help others recognize their need to sympathetically understand another, or in Adam's case, to discover what true sympathy is.

We see how Mr Irvine attempts to help others recognize their need for sympathy in the following passage where he reminds the misogynist Bartie Murray that he must not let his feelings about Betty, and worse in general, affect his sympathetic feeling with Adam. "I'm afraid you have too little fellow-feeling in what you consider his weakness about Betty" (444; ch.42). Mr Irvine recognizes Bartie's particular weakness of placing safe blame on women in general, and points out that this is affecting his capacity to feel sympathy with Adam, for Betty is, as Mr Irvine knows, Adam's weak spot. Bartie's particular expression of feeling for Adam offers him the opportunity to express his own feelings about women and how he feels this particular woman, Betty, has been Adam's ruin. "If he hadn't had so much hard work to do, poor fellow, he might have gone into the higher branches, [of education] and then this might never have happened--might never have happened" (445; ch.42). We see that unlike Bartie, he feels it is his duty to remain silent about his own feelings while he is listening to others. "I've a great deal that's painful on my mind, and find it hard work to be quite silent about my

own feelings and only attend to others' (443; ch.3). Nevertheless, I believe that this aspect of Mr Irwin's nature hardly reveals that he is aware of the severity of Adam's unethical disposition, and he recognises that at this point, Adam is incapable of properly entering into another's sufferings.

Mr Irwin plays then, a crucial role in Adam's final discovery and understanding of true sympathy. It is he who helps Adam to discover that his perception of Betty has been wrong all along, and that his desire for revenge upon Arthur will only make him feel better. When Adam immediately expresses his desire to take vengeance upon Arthur for "ruining" his "sweet Betty" (444; ch.4), it is Mr Irwin who reminds him who he is accusing Arthur up against his own moral yard stick, and in seeking revenge only selfishly: "You have no right to say that the guilt of her crime lies with him, and that he ought to bear the punishment. It is not for us men to apportion the shares of moral guilt and retribution" (445). Not only does Mr Irwin point out that Adam's attempt to right what he believes is Arthur's wrong is morally improper, but he also pinpoints the error of Adam's weakness: that is, that he is unable to involve himself--sympathetically--in parts of others' lives. Mr Irwin's speech below, is one of the purest expressions of Elliot's 'doctrine of sympathy,' and the effect which all men's lives have upon others'.

You can't isolate yourself, and say that the evil which is in you shall not spread. Men's lives are so thoroughly blended with each other as the air they breathe; evil spreads as necessarily as disease. I know, I feel the terrible extent of suffering this sin of Arthur's has caused by giving; but we don't every sin cause suffering to others besides those he commit it. An act of vengeance on your part against Arthur would simply be another evil added to those we are suffering under. (left emphasis mine)

Mr. Traine is therefore helping Allen recognize that he is not the only person who has suffered in this tragedy. He helps him realize that only when he recognizes what true sympathy is, which is understanding one's life within the context of others' lives and the by seeing a part of himself in another, he will no longer be deceiving himself.

And Allen does embrace this new discovery--about himself--and about his longivity perception that he was properly exercising sympathy for Emily by consistently accusing her. Though he still does retain his initial discovery concerning his need to have sympathy of fellow feeling for those who are morally weaker than himself, he has also learned that he must not pick and choose for whom he should or should not feel sympathy. And part of his discovery is that by attempting to feel an imaginary sense

of sympathy for Betty, even with the best intentions, he was still sympathizing others, like Arthur, who experienced his own kind of suffering. When he meets with Arthur in the woods, even before Betty's execution date, he recognizes his mistake, and puts Mr Irvine's advice into action. "I've been a bit hard to everybody but her. I felt as if nobody pitied her enough--her suffering out into no soul" (204; ch.14). And when Arthur expresses the pain he feels for being unable to get a full pardon for Betty's crime and save her from death, Adam recognizes Arthur's suffering as his own. "'Ah, sir,' said Adam, for the first time feeling his own pain merged with sympathy for Arthur, 'you and me'll often be thinking o' the same thing, when we're a long way off one another. I pray God to help you, as I pray him to help me'" (205; ch.14). For the first time, we see Adam sharing emotion--specifically, pain, and therefore giving validity to the other.

First then, Adam allows Adam to enjoy his new found understanding of sympathy by joining him with Dinah, and Adam recognizes sincere love and sincere sympathy by taking heed of Mr Irvine's words. He sees, in the end, that his mistaken notion of sympathy for Betty and his mistaken notion that she loved him and felt sympathy for him in return, has led him--through a baptism of fire-- to a much more meaningful love and a much more meaningful sympathetic relationship with Dinah.

It's like what I feel about Noah: I should never
 be' come to know that her love 'ud be the greatest
 o' blessings to me, if what I counted a blessing
 hadn't been wrenched and torn away from me, and
 left me with a greater need, so as I could come
 and longer for a greater and a better comfort.
 (189; ch.11)

By joining Adam and Noah, Eliot also offers them both avenues upon which they can, in their own way's, and as marriage partners, achieve sympathy within a marriage. As I have noted before, Adam recognizes that this marriage can only help both of them to sympathetically understand one another's joys and sorrows, as well as the people with whom they associate in daily life. "The more we know of [love and happiness] the better we can feel what other people's lives are or might be, and so we shall only be more tender to 'em and help 'em," he says to Noah of their marriage (189; ch.12). Eliot also suggests that Noah's work in the private realm, rather than the public, will help them both in their quest to reach and "blend with" other men's--and women's' lives. The marriage that serves two purposes: it puts to work Adam's new found discovery of what sympathy is, after revealing the long and tedious process of discovering it, and it allows Noah to share her talent of sympathetically--and humanistically--reaching people with the Word of God. As Adam's begin is considered the last of

Eliot's early works of fiction, it is appropriate that, after all the failed starling figures in the quest of Marion's life, Eliot would end this series with two figures who do, in the end, achieve what the others could not.

CONCLUSION

Edna Felt was the novel which ended Marian Lewis' need for the pseudonym 'George Eliot,' at least as a means of disguising her gender and identity. In 1880, when Edna was published and hence distributed to the public, the curiosity concerning both 'George Eliot's' identity and his/her gender was so pervasive that Marian and George Henry Lewis chose to divulge the true identity of the enigmatic 'Mr Eliot.'

It marks an end then in several ways, for it is, first and foremost, the last work to which Marian Lewis attached the name 'George Eliot' believing that otherwise its publication and recognition as a valid piece of literature would not take place. While she toyed with the notion of dropping the pseudonym in 1880 since her circle of literary associates knew that she and 'George Eliot' were one and the same, she continued to use the pseudonym to sign all of her subsequent works. At the time when she was just beginning to enter the literary world, however, both she and George Lewis were concerned that if any of her works had a woman's name attached to them, they would not be taken seriously, or perhaps would simply be considered, at best, as only contributing to the stockpile of other "illy women's novels," the very novels against which Marian Lewis had

already protested in her early reviews. The use of a pseudonym, then, for an unknown, unestablished woman writer was essential for survival in the world of publication. Furthermore, Miss Fels is the last work by Eliot which deals with the rural overcast figure and the theme of expressing sympathy for man's "fellow man" within a rustic, predominantly church-going community. Miss Fels marks the end to her early fiction, then, both as the last instance of her need to use a pseudonym, and the end of her use of certain themes, expressions of her new humanistic understanding of her early Christian beliefs.

Though Miss Fels marks the end of Marion Lewis' basic need for the pseudonym 'George Eliot,' she did, however, continue to use it to edge all of her subsequent novels. As we saw in chapter 4, Marion Lewis subtly expressed her desire to expose her true identity--and name--to the public, to her publishers who were very much against this plan. The name 'George Eliot,' they knew, was associated in the public's mind with successful, bestselling novels, and they did not want to destroy that association by suddenly removing the name from circulation. The name now signifies not a means to conceal identity and gender but a means to give new works a common identity in connection with the old.

After Miss Fels had proved its success, and after having begun the composition of The Mill on the Floss, Marion Lewis interrupted her work in 1866 to write a short

novelle entitled "The Lifted Veil." This novella is a pseudoscientific tale of a doctor who, metaphorically, "lifts the veil" of death by reviving and bringing to life a woman who has already died. With this one great revival, many symbolic "veils" are lifted, exposing people for what and who they truly are. Marian Leves' publishers were quick to recognize her own desire to "lift the veil" or remove her pseudonyms, which would expose her true identity, and advised her against it. We can only surmise that Marian Leves was, after all, willing to choose to continue using "George Eliot" to mark the authorship of her novella, for I contend that through the portrayal of her characters in her early works of fiction, we can see that she had come to recognize the power which naming affords one.

From Mary Ann Evans, to Marian Leves, to George Eliot, to Mary Anne Evans, names play an important role in this woman's life and in her identity. As I have shown in chapter one, the woman we know as "George Eliot" never alleges one particular name to define her; instead she finds pleasure in the playful use of familiar nicknames even before she assumes the pen name "George Eliot." Today Leves's notions of subjectivity, which reveal a departure from Freud's notions that a subject strives to be a whole, complete, unified being (what Leves calls a "subject of certainty"), I claim that Mary Ann Evans avoids this, at any cost, and instead thrives on what may be considered a

locution approach to subjectivity, one which demands, rewards, and requires fragmentation, division, and the multiplicity of self. I show in this chapter how she chose to "divide" herself, using names, and claim that in such her division, with each new name, a part, a fragment of her former self still remains.

I also show in chapter one the way in which George Henry Lewes' use of the non preferred pen name 'Virion' offered an example of how a writer could see another name to divide himself from a name and an identity that might, otherwise, define him or her as whole, unified, or certain. I also pointed in this chapter my discovery that Marian Lewes wrote some leading articles, which she left unsigned, for George Lewes while he was ill and could not write them himself. Most importantly, she respected his pen name enough not to appropriate it herself in his absence. Lewes' influence on Marian's perception of her own subjectivity and later of her characters' subjectivity, then, was crucial, for he helped her to recognize the need to see a part of one's self in another. So much did she want Lewes to be a part of her life, both personally and professionally that she assumed part of his name, "George," as part of her own pseudonym, a gesture of respect for him. This habit of seeing a part of one's self in another, I claim, becomes the foundation for Eliot's perception of the empathetic relationship she engenders in her early fiction.

In chapters two, three, and four, I show how Eliot, in her early works of fiction, reveals how this power of seeing can either enhance or detrimentally affect the sympathetic relationship, depending on whether the user exploits the seeing process by reducing the seen to one definition or allows the seeing process to reveal flourishing possibilities for another. In "The Red Fortunes of the Barons Barton" we see that the Countess Starinski, whose own self appropriated name or title ("the Countess") depicts her authority over the Barton household, goes so far as insisting that Milly's next child, which will of course be a girl, must be named "Gertrude," after herself. The Countess is incapable of experiencing sympathy because she is unable to recognize a part of herself in the goodness of others, even those who are right under her nose. Milly Barton, however, is capable of experiencing sympathy, for there is a multiplicity to her nature which enables her to see a part of herself in all of those around her, particularly in her children. The way in which she passes her children, one by one, at her deathbed, reveals that she recognizes a part of herself in them and that she also recognizes parts of them in herself. Indeed, she leaves a part of her egoistic nature with her daughter Betty, whom she requests, by name, carry on the role of caretaker of the children. Betty then becomes a part of Milly's flourishing, fragmentary nature.

In "Israel's Repentance" we see one way that Robert

Computer, as a human subject of certainty, imposes his reality upon others, and totally disregards the possibility of sympathetic othersness, and that is by naming and defining. He rebukes Mr Tryon who seeks to reform the church and make the Gospel accessible to all, by labeling him a radical Presbyterian. Computer does this ostensibly because he thinks Tryon is intentionally upsetting established church doctrine, but really because he wishes to impose his own standards and names on everything. Computer improperly defines the word "Presbyterian": he thinks the denomination is named after a person who does not even exist, the "villain" John Presbyterian, the radical, he mistakenly thinks, who began all of the religious discussion in the first place. Elitch shows how Computer's labeling of Mr Tryon is morally wrong by revealing him as an ignorant fool who does not have his historical facts straight, for no John Presbyterian ever existed in history. We also see that Computer chooses naming and at the same time imposes his certainty upon Tryon by making up headlines which mock Mr Tryon's name in several ways. He plays upon both Tryon's name and the kind Mr Jerome's name, using such name-like way a child would--such as "Mr Try-it-on" and "The lamentations of Mr Jeremiah" to impose his certainty upon them, by means of definition.

Finally, we see in John Kane how Elitch uses the power of naming to reveal and celebrate friends' fellowship. Every

of the people who are waiting to hear Black people preach on the grass are (male) Methodists who, as Eliot points out, all have names which are parts of other women's names. In my argument that Black, as a female preacher, is not attempting to infiltrate the masculine status quo (which by its very nature defines society), but is attempting instead to share a part of it with the predominantly male society, we see that both men and women share parts of one another's names, presumably out of love and respect for another family member. And this sharing of names is not exclusively confined by either men or women. Though "Thad's Mom" and "Timothy's Mom" are women whose names contain parts of their fathers' names, Timothy's Mom's child, through a wife, receives a part of her name; he is named "Timothy's Mom's Son," which signifies affectionately for this wife child both a part of his mother's name and a part of his grandfather's name, both the feminine and the masculine. Now Eliot celebrates the power of naming by showing the way in which names can be shared, as parts of others, even across gender lines. We see this, of course, both in Lanes' use of the pseudonym "Virian" and Marian Evans' use of the pseudonym "George Eliot," for both names cut across gender lines, and signify, in Lanes' case, at least the possibility of the feminine, and in Marian's case, the hope that at least the name 'George' would signify the masculine.

Eliot, as the narrative who expresses moral values, can

show us Betty Cornell's novel failings by offering names for her objects. This naming implies that she recognizes that Betty's relationship with her objects is much more important--to Betty--than her relationship with other human beings. Betty, she shows, has no truly interactive, sympathetic relationship with others, but that she does have is a relationship with her objects--her mirror, her locket, her scarf, her sparkling glass earrings, which represent the literary, aesthetic relationship she has with the beautiful things her mirror offers her. Eliot offers her own initial commentary on this intense involvement with objects by giving these objects, with very childlike names "Archiebie," "Mabelie," and "Treasure Box," implying that Betty's perception of what is truly important is nothing more sophisticated than a child's perception.

The writer we know as "George Eliot" then, who used so many names throughout both her personal and professional life, as I have shown, thrived on fragmentation and the multiplicity of self by using a variety of names herself. Because Eliot celebrates the multiplicity of self and avoids the certainty of wholeness and unity, she often shows in her early fiction the danger of using names as labels. At other times, however, she shows how naming, particularly the sharing of parts of names, can strengthen and enhance a sympathetic relationship.

Lucan's theory that the "subject of certainty" who

strives for a complete, whole, unified image of him or herself is only imaginary and that healthy, productive relationships are only formed when a subject sees a part of himself in another, has helped us to interpret Eliot's perception of interactive sympathy and her celebration of the "we" of humanity. We also see that he, like Eliot, denounces the naming process when it becomes instead a labeling process. In *Reveries XX*, his final reviewer, Leona shows that "woman," as a category, does not exist, and strikes through what he claims is the label for women, which is the very word itself. He strikes through the article "The," whose capitalization, I believe, indicates the certainty of womanhood and that woman herself is considered as absolute. He offers women instead the referred *The Woman*. This new "name" indicates Leona's recognition of the gender--he uses not a word (woman) to virtually spiritualize her in writing--as well as his recognition that the gender is labeled and categorized, thus he strikes out the absolute article (The) which defines her.

We have seen, then, in Eliot's early fiction that naming can either advance or prevent sympathy from coming between humans. Her celebration of the multiplicity and fragmentary nature of self, which she expresses through her own example of naming, is only one of the ways which she shows us, out of the numerous possibilities, the importance of sharing parts or fragments of one's self with one's

believe men or women. From the women Mary Anne Evans to the writer George Eliot, to the characters of the early fiction, we see that reading is one way in which all can become a part of the sympathetic, all connecting web of humanity.

APPENDIX

Writings by George Eliot

NovelsJones of Marston's Life (Edinburgh, 1858)Adam Bede (Edinburgh, 1859)The Mill on the Floss (Edinburgh, 1860)Silas Marner, The Weaver of Raveloe (Edinburgh, 1861)Scotsie (London, 1861)Ellen Dale, the Radical (Edinburgh, 1864)Middlemarch: A Study of Provincial Life (Edinburgh,
1871-1872)Canterbury Tales (Edinburgh, 1869)Novellas"The Lifted Veil" (1859)"Brother Jacob" (1864)PoetryThe Spanish Friar: A Poem (Edinburgh, 1860)"Brether and Sister" (1860)"How nice loved the king" (London, 1868)The Legend of John and Other Poems (Edinburgh, 1874)Complete Poems (1886)Essays

Impermanence of the Christian Era (Edinburgh, 1879)

Essays and Lectures from a Notebook (Edinburgh, 1884)

Early Essays (London, 1818)

Translations

The Life of Jesus, Critically Examined, by David Friedrich Strauss (London, 1847)

The Essence of Christianity, by Ludwig Feuerbach (London, 1844)

Stilling, by Benedict de Spinoza (London, 1808)

Tractatus Theologico-Politicus, by Benedict de Spinoza (Newbury, 1978)

Collections

The Works, 8 vols. (Edinburgh, 1807-20)

The Works, Critical Edition, 18 vols. (Edinburgh, 1874-1881)

The Complete Posthumous Works (New York, 1848)

The Works, Warwick Edition, 12 vols. (Edinburgh, 1901-3)

The Works, 21 vols. (London, 1848-11)

WRITINGS ABOUT GEORGE ELIOT

Atwell, Harriet Fawcett. "George Eliot and 'Miss Brooke'" In

Widdowson,² Nineteenth-Century Fiction 18 (1944):

89-93.

Explores the character development of George Eliot, from Eliot's conception of her in Book One to her emergence as Mrs. Casaubon. Draws parallels between Caroline and EL.

Teresa, showing the ways in which Caroline is a martyr by choosing to marry Cassius. Caroline survives and one's capacity for fellow feeling which must emerge from tragedy as signs of restoration.

Jacelin, Jean-Claude. "The Opening of Daniel Deronda."

Colloque victorien & édouardien (Montpellier) 28
(1980): 116-118.

Claims that "In Daniel Deronda, George Eliot, setting out in media res, offers a fascinating beginning, by showing the heroes of the two parts of the novel and by introducing some major themes which will be developed in the course of the narrative. In addition, some of the novelist's intentions concerning the type and technique of the novel, its rhythm and structure, can be inferred from the opening pages."

Kearney, Nina. "The Power of Ringers: Deronda and Maggie Tulliver." Nineteenth-Century Fiction 39(1984): 188-216.

Analyses The Mill on the Floss as Gothic romance. Outlines Maggie's destructive turn, from her Helen-like fall to the dead rebirth she leaves Tom. Forecasts that her destructive nature is "an outgrowth of the environment defined by the 'miserable little Floss and Tullivers'." She looks for attention (love) and finds it in sexualization. Argues that Maggie's emotions, sensuality, hunger for love, and her instinct to kill and to die are all interconnected.

Kesten, John. "Why Feminist Critics are Angry with George Eliot." College English 37 (1984): 549-61.

Feminist critics are angry with Eliot's handling of Caroline Deronda is ~~misleadingly~~ because she did not allow Caroline to do what she, Eliot, did in real life. Critics believe Eliot should portray active and ambitious women who seek out alternatives to traditional female life-styles--as Eliot herself did. Argues that Eliot's heroine could be "more than wife, wife, and mother" only if Eliot had written "exclusively about herself."

Kerriss, Caroline. "The Open-Endedness of Daniel Deronda."

In Theory and Desire: George Eliot's Novels.

London: Routledge, 1989: 143-214.

Argues that "Gwendolen makes a breakthrough in George Eliot's acceptance of herself," claims that Eliot selected her earlier heroines: Elsie, Maggie, and Derwent with characteristics she herself did not possess. Claims that Marian Lewis, though painfully aware of her flaws, was "wise, selfish, prone to hysteria, and at times insensitive," all characteristics that are used in Gwendolen. Therefore, "when her audience accepted Gwendolen, they accepted, for the first time, ... not the 'self that realized itself', but the part of Marian from who had found it necessary to take over, to sustain," claims that, unlike her earlier novels, the "Moral Lesson" in Daniel Deronda is no longer a woman (Elsie, Maggie, Derwent), but a man, Daniel. Claims that in this novel we see the last vestiges of Eliot's Christianity, unlike her earlier characters who looked for "something better than simple love," she begins, in Daniel Deronda, to accept human nature as it is, revealing Deronda as "caring and compassionately self-seeking." Examines the problems Eliot faces in providing Gwendolen with a young man, claiming that she has departed from the earlier heroine who was the "ministering angel" such as Elsie, Janet, Elsie, Maggie, Maggie, and Derwent. Attributes Gwendolen's difficulty in finding a suitable partner to her gender. Examines the reasons why Gwendolen and Deronda do not marry, claiming that Deronda is "both the authentic and the disguised twin of Gwendolen." Gwendolen and Deronda are both as assertive and power-seeking as the other.

Rees, Gillian. George Eliot. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1981.

Provides a number of articles dealing with Eliot as a woman writer. In way of reading Eliot as a woman who set out to write feminist novels, instead, Rees insists that "writing as a woman means writing as a human." Claims that Eliot's use of "we" is her narrative allow us to move outside of prescriptive gender roles. In this light, other articles look at Maggie Tulliver's passion as desire for knowledge, sexual love, and freedom, at the heroine's "male" narrative is her early fiction she portrays the ordinariness of ordinary women in terms of classical life and who is able to "sacrifice" both body and mind in some form at the ways in which Middlemarch is linked in touch with feminist issues of the 1820's and 1830's, at Daniel Deronda and Gwendolen Harleth who raised the exceptional position given them, and who, in the end, escape those positions.

Sell, Marielissa. "Love, Marriage and Work in Daniel

Gertrude's "Sovereign Society" Notes 17 (1947): 43-55.

Looks at the ways in which Gertrude's and Geraldine's goals are abiding within the structure of Victorian society, but because of that very society, their fates are ultimately different. Gertrude wishes to be a gentleman and Geraldine, a princess and powerful lady. However, a laissez-faire capitalistic society makes it difficult for women like Gertrude to be useful and good for her marriage is a matter of (dis)social necessity and not choice. With Gertrude Gertrude, "it has become clear to the novelist that a happy marriage is not always a reality in her society."

Blake, Kathleen. "Middlemarch and the Women Question."

Nineteenth-Century Fiction 40 (1994): 345-312.

Analysis of arguments against Middlemarch as a feminist novel. Qualifies the novel as feminist and deals with the "Women Question" by assessing the actual stereotypes concerning work, marriage, and education for women and shows the ways Gertrude contends with them.

Brown, Joseph. "The Pacification of the Crowd: from

"Janet's Experience" to Felix Holt." Nineteenth-Century Fiction 30 (1980): 348-51.

Discusses the communal action of the crowd in "Janet's Experience", Novels, and Felix Holt. The author argues that Eliot's use of the crowd in her fiction reveals her ambivalence to her own contemporary political issues. Interprets the crowd as Eliot's [dis]approval of "inappropriate frivolity" because it disrupts the intimacy of the mind, social community.

Carpenter, Mary Wilson. "'A Bit of Her Flesh': Circumcision

and the 'Signification of the Flesh' in David Copperfield."

Gertrude 2 (1988): 1-23.

A Lacanian analysis of circumcision in David Copperfield. Discusses in detail the harmonization of circumcision. Draws parallels between actual cutting off that occurs during circumcision and symbolic (representational) cutting off in the novel. Reads Gertrude's flesh as the Imaginary phallus--also is what the author desires. Not the narrative desires to cut off Gertrude's agency, her "prideful phallic fantasy." Argues that "George Eliot's text...remains in the pain of the daughter's 'circumcision,' constructing a female critique of circumcision." What is desired then is a female dialectic or bond between mother and daughter. The phallus (or its lack) does not matter here; rather, the narrative elides language from the traditional discourse on (male)

circumcision and creates a "painful and difficult desire for an 'other' who is also the same." While Victorians saw circumcision merely as a rite formulated sociologically between men in conventional religion, this reading "deconstructs a bond between women in George Eliot's last novel."

Carroll, David. *George Eliot: The Critical Heritage*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1971.

Offers thirteen reviews of each of Eliot's novels by different authors. Includes five general overviews of Eliot's life and career by her contemporaries.

---. "George Eliot: The Myth of Narcissa." *Studies in the Novel* 12 (1980): 18-25.

Examines, primarily, ways in which Eliot was viewed by her contemporary female readers, despite her religious beliefs and her ideas concerning marriage. Argues that her novels are not "devotional literature," but "deeply experiential in life." Suggests there is a tension in her works between her desire to encapsulate the truth and her uneasiness about doing so.

---. "Middlemarch and the Subversivity of Fact." In *This Particular Web: Essays on Middlemarch*. Edited by Ian Adam. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979. 71-80.

Examines the idea of the disengaged mind--one that has overcome vision and is now challenging reality. Looks at the ways in which characters interpret their world, viewing Lydgate as the subversive and Gaskell as the idealist who "face the terrible ambiguity that reality is both inner and outer." Looks at Fildeside/Haffes, Don-Chat/Cassida, Lydgate/Hammond relationships in this way.

Chase, Cynthia. "The Decomposition of the Elephant: Reading Reading Daniel Deronda." *ESQ* 33 (1976): 122-27.

A deconstructionist reading of the novel. Takes off from a letter from Hans Kryniah to Deronda. Argues that the novel disfigures its own rhetorical principles, the allusion to a "linguistic fact or art." This fact is Deronda's disconnection. Argues that the creation of his circumcision is a condition for the unfolding of the narrative and the question of Deronda's identity.

Christ, Carol. "Repression and Provocation: Death." *Novels: A Series on Reading* 2 (1976): 130-48.

Argues that the girls Eliot's protagonists feel when they fear that the death of the person they love is within their power becomes a way for them to conquer aggression and therefore lead a life that coincides with carefully the needs and sufferings of others. Eliot likens the tragic capabilities of her heroines by using presidential death.

Court, Franklin. "The Image of St. Theresa in Hochmensch and Feminist Fables." The Victorian Newsletter 7 (1981): 41-49.

Offers some reasons based on biography for Eliot's choice of the St. Theresa figure in the Fables of Hochmensch. Argues that Eliot would have no luck with "masculine and a certain degree of movement on the surface for this modern day Theresa's 'vocation'." Sees the only true links between St. Theresa and Caroline in Caroline's "non-like" religious commitment. Offers a feminist reading of the novel, regarding any implicit association between St. Theresa and Caroline as ironic. The St. Theresa image therefore supports Eliot's feminist idea that the problem with religious devotion is the insistence on confined action.

Cross, J.-M. George Eliot's Life as Reflected in Her Letters and Journals. 2 vols. London: Blackwood and Sons, 1896.

Provides a strictly historical account of Eliot's life, including information from her letters and notebooks. An obituary and is a degree segregated account written by her husband. Full of rich material, important dates, and events.

Davies, Glenn. "The Strange Case of Monomaniacal Patriarchy in Lilacs, Murder in Hochmensch, Growing in Janini, Excuse." Representations 15 (1984): 88-104.

Defines monomania as a division between the feminine... "will separated from action, reason from will, action from reason." The condition is "feminine." Asserts that Madame Laura as well as Caroline commit monomaniacal because "murder is no longer a matter of conscious action; rather actions can be given problematic names by the larger pattern 'patriarchy' that covers all women... who are objects of prophetic and mental design." Also argues that Gertrude in Janini Excuse "desired but did not intend her act, which is thus closer to understanding." She is freed then from the responsibility of Gertrude's drowning. Monomania, then, is a metaphor for women desiring to end brutal male power. Asserts that "that power may indeed

lopes, yet they [women] do not murder it."

Emworth, Lee, "Women, Energy, and Middlemarch," in Women, Sex, and Society, edited by Lee Emworth, Mary Smith, and Lisa Smith. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1972: 227-28.

Examines, first, the notion of a female virtue inspired by her past experiences to enlighten women and energy in *Middlemarch*. Lee's energy is typically seen as ambivalent but energy in women is seen as something men must conquer to, and lose everything by, including their masculinity. Looks at the ways in which doctors and husbands handle internal energy within Victorian society.

Emworth, Elizabeth. "Determinism: George Eliot's Description of 'Determining Law'." Elizabethan-Century Fiction 27 (1974): 272-284.

Attempts to clarify the paradox of Eliot's determinist idea that moral law is something "divisible," beyond human control, that we are free and her belief in the "determining law" of moral consequences. "George Eliot distinguishes two senses of the word law...the cultural (or moral) and the natural (or natural)."

Gilbert, Sandra. "Life's Empty Puck: Helen Browder's Literary Nuptialroom." Critical Inquiry 11 (1985): 285-88.

Asserts that every literary mother presents her daughter with a figurative empty puck that represents the disinheritance of female culture. She is then obliged to speak of her own powerlessness. Uses this theory to look at "mother"/daughter relationships in *Silas Marner*. Claims that Apple must be for the father--his treasure his seed, his value alone she has inherited an empty puck and must be to the father.

Gilbert, Sandra M. and Susan Gubar. "George Eliot as the Angel of Desolation." In The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979. 479-520.

Begin with a detailed analysis of Eliot's situation in American villages Margaret Fuller and Harriet Beecher Stowe, whose families once female authorship were similar. Eliot was "drawn to the possibility of a uniquely female tradition in literature, characterized by loss rather than gain," the sentimental literary characteristic espoused by Stowe and was fascinated by her stories as allegories on class ideas. See Women of Letters: Life as Eliot's

Identification with the 'Angel of Destruction', arguing that "Emily Barton's female Identification with Death is a means of obtaining power," thus a reprobation between the female identification of Eliot's characters and her own (Eliot's own) female vengeance. Examines how *The Mill on the Floss*, *Middlemarch*, and *Lamia* provide all female punishing self-characters who "specifically symbolize patriarchal power."

Grever, Suzanne. "The Author as Citizen: Daniel Deronda." In George Eliot and Community: A Study in Social Theory and Political Thought. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994. 298-328.

Examines Eliot's address to the reader in the novel by looking at the way in which she implores the reader to "imagine a great many things about a great many characters." Claims that for Eliot, the power to imagine is meant to focus the reader's attention "primarily on the lot of women" and in a way that makes understanding the characters' feelings much more important than judging their failures. Examines Deronda, Lydie Deane, and the Princess in this light. Claims also that Eliot uses this technique of addressing the reader to offer commentary upon men and women which makes the reader disapprove of the conventional double standard women faced.

---. "Eugenie Fawcett, Daniel Deronda." In George Eliot and Community: A Study in Social Theory. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994. 329-341.

Exam John Stuart Mill's *The Subjection of Women* to explore various examples of male oppression in Daniel Deronda. Exam Deronda's marriage to Grandcourt as an example of Mill's belief that women are forced into marriage by "[arbitrary] closing all other doors against them." Claims that in this novel, unlike any of her others, Eliot explores the increasing "degenerative disease" of society while at the same time celebrating the "voluntary affirmation of community."

Greene, Richard E. "Another Look at Deronda's Marriages." Literature and Psychology 18 (1983): 31-43.

Psychoanalytic reading of Deronda's marriages to Grandcourt and Ladislas in *Middlemarch*. Uses psychoanalytic theory of Karen Horney to show the ways in which Deronda's self-distrust results in her attraction to Grandcourt, a father figure. A Horneyan reading sees her marriage to Ladislas as only a partial fulfillment "through actual love...and vicarious service to the community." Thus, she

never finds an equal in love. She fearlessly re-examines her relationship to Luchian, a relationship which allows her to express sexual generosity to the people of Blackheath and to have "a socially sanctioned kind of love in her marriage. She Freudian Psychoanalyzes to explain the repressed rage she feels in her marriage to Luchian.

Delar, Susan. "The Black Paper" and the Issues of Female Creativity." Critical Inquiry 23 (1997): 242-62.

Provides extensive background information supporting the view in which women in an absence, an other (Susan de Beauvoir), an object, the written (Dorothy Brooks is a poet) instead of the writer. Claims that nineteenth-century women writers feared that their attempts at writing were presumptuous and even disturbing. Thus "the woman who cannot become an artist" (nevertheless turns herself into "an artistic subject." Examines the ways in which Eliot's heroines (Isabelle Barish and Emily Barrett) have been defined by "self-destructive narcissism."

Haight, Gordon S. A Geography of George Eliot. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940.

Includes fifty-two essays on Eliot's works, chronologically arranged from the appearance of *Scenes of Clerical Life* until 1940. Provides an overview of Eliot's reputation as an author.

---. George Eliot: A Biography. New York: Oxford University Press, 1940.

The "classic and definitive" Eliot biography, based on Haight's work as editor of the *George Eliot Letters*. It is very conservative, factual, and cautious interpretation. Takes George Eliot at face value and provides a detailed account of her life.

Halperin, John. "George Eliot." In English and Self-Consciousness in the Victorian Novel: Studies in the Novel of Sentiment in the Nineteenth Century. New York: New Franklin, 1974. 113-31.

Examines Eliot's theme of psychological and moral growth of those protagonists who begin in self-absorbing egotism and move to a more complete self-knowledge which in turn results in an understanding of the suffering of others. Looks at this theme in *Adam Bede*, *Blackheath*, and Social Problems.

Hardy, Barbara. "Implications and Incompleteness: George

Eliot's *Widdowson*. "In the Approximate Form, As
Given in the Novel. New York: The Athene Press, 1944;
167-168.

Examines the theme in the structure and unity of *Widdowson*. Focuses the novel for the way in which it equates as briefly as the theme of sexual impotence involving Caroline and Jacobson with the "ending September" of characters elsewhere in the novel. Cites Caroline's failure to feel what she is in Bonn and Calle's "eggless and superficial common sense" as examples. Claims that the novel's structural flow lies in the restricted treatment of sex....in Caroline's relationship with Will Ladislaw." It falls due to an absence of truthfulness. Thus, a structural flow exists as truth is vividly present elsewhere.

- , "Widdowson and the Passions," in This Particular
Part: Essays on Widdowson. Edited by Ted Alden.
Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976: 8-11.

Examines the close relationship between Caroline Brooke and Will Ladislaw. Shows the way in which Eliot uses passionate language to reveal her characters' inner lives and outer expressions, the way their feeling influences their conduct, the way feeling is related to thought and action. Concludes that Ladislaw's passion remains itself in the shape of the artist and is subjected to strong criticism while Caroline's "misdirected play of passion is not quite unclouded by irony" either.

- , "Widdowson: Public and Private Worlds," in
Particularities: Studies in George Eliot. London: Peter
Owen, 1981: 121-129.

Discusses the "plurality of personal worlds" as presented in *Widdowson*. Asserts that "George Eliot's way of connecting outer and inner, public and private, historic and anachronistic, is to invoke and undermine the link within the individual consciousness."

- , "Possibilities," in A Century of George Eliot
Criticism. Edited by Gordon S. Haight. Boston:
Houghton Mifflin Company, 1949. 215-24.

Examines the possibilities Eliot leaves open for her characters. Claims that "the hiked possible world" in *David Copperfield* is there to give the sense of immediate crisis" as Caroline imagines her future before deciding to marry Grandcourt. Notes that "the central created possibility" in the novel lies in the relationship between Grandcourt and Caroline; that at, we never know what might

happen between them. The end of the novel itself suggests the possibility that Kate Meyrick may be a part of a happy future for Oswalden. Notes that there is no real return of Oswalden's consciousness after the heading accident and claims that her unfinished ending has "special thematic significance" for, free of Oswalden and left without friends, she faces "the shock of a 'narrow and protracted vision for the first time.'"

---, J. Willie Miller & Richard Poirer. "Killingworth: Chapter 15: Three Communities." Widdowson's Literary Fiction 15 (1986): 191-193.

Hardy uses the Surges quotation from Virginia's Foreword to support the theme of moral consciousness and to explain its appropriateness to the tone of the chapter in which Subtlety's consciousness is more pointedly by means of the past. Miller looks closely at Eliot's use of the "paradox" technique, noting that the source of her individual narrative authority is the same as the source for her ability to have sympathy for others. Points out that while Surges sees man's judgment as false and God's judgment as true, Eliot sees God only as a subjective projection, therefore, it is possible to reason any act as a good act. Surges's "restraint" is forced by God while Subtlety is released--"like," surges--"by his power. Thus he is more pitiable. Poirer uses the chapter as a commentary on judgments that is, that Eliot does not judge her characters, for all men and women are destined to be disoriented in her novel.

Jackson, Ariane W. "Racial Identity and the Victorian Search for Identity." Studies in the Novel 3 (1972): 28-39.

Claims that in David Ricardo "George Eliot wished to present her concept of the new man, product of an age of increasing disorder. Ricardo's particular response to modernity is a weakness or mutilation of will, and it is precisely this deficiency, its causes and possible consequences, that George Eliot understood as a most serious danger to the Victorian man. David Ricardo is a Victorian in search of a literal, racial identity, but this search also has psychological and social dimensions and is closely related to George Eliot's theory of responsiveness and communication."

Jackson, Mary. "The Question of Language Use of Women and The Will on the Floor." Critical Inquiry 8 (1982): 297-322.

Applies feminist ideologic theories to the Will on the

Flora, establishing the way in which the female is determined and defined by discourse. Argues that Maggie can only speak man's talk and that can only hear woman's speech as female talk. Feminist writings, especially those of Jane Iquray, are examined.

Jones, Henry. "Social Records: A Conversation." In A Garland of George Eliot Criticism. Edited by Gordon S. Knight. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1963: 77-111.

A conversation between two Italian women, Theodora and Feltham, and one Italian man, Constantino, who are discussing Social Records. They discuss the novel in terms of its social qualities, its history, and its portrayal of characters, critical that "they are described and analyzed to death." All agree on the success of the *Kindred* and the *Septimus*.

---. "The Novels of George Eliot." Atlantic Monthly 18 (1866): 479-491.

A critique of Eliot's novels by one of her American contemporaries. Criticizes "the staid and traditional character" as being "embodied by the over diffuseness of the narrative and the excess of local touches." Criticized of Eliot's overabundant use of observation and commentary as it slows down the dramatic movement. Praises Ellen Warner as the best of Eliot's works for its "abandon of local ends and passing issues." Aspects Betty (argues) out of all of Eliot's female figures because she is "the least ambitious, and on the whole, I think, the most successful." Enjoys David Morris but is skeptical that a woman as limited by religious fervor can remain "so cool-headed and so temperate."

Kochfleischer, U.C. "George Eliot, Feuerbach, and the Question of Criticism." Victorian Studies 44 (1994): 564-588.

Analyzes *Adam Bede* in light of Feuerbach's non-centered religion which states that elements such as heaven and the lord's supper are only man's vibration for the forces of nature. Contends that in Adam Bede, through a series of "symbolic images," Eliot depicts the "essential and moral" situation of Adam. Ultimately, he is converted to a " Feuerbachian religion of suffering".

---. "Middlemarch: An Evolving View." Middlemarch Century Fiction 18 (1978): 83-81.

Argues that Eliot subverts the stereotype of the omniscient/father figure who is always in control. Eliot instead creates a female story with Brother's character as the catalyst for the wealth she has with Will and in contrast without Gwendolen's estate. Creates a detailed discussion of Dutch Earth, the state who possesses a sense of purpose and understanding that others do not have and therefore is a better uncle/father figure than both Mr. Brooke and Mr. Caswell.

Lewis, P.B. "Daniel Deronda and The Portrait of a Lady." in The Great Tradition: George Eliot, Henry James, Joseph Conrad. New York: New York University Press, 1966. 11-121.

A detailed analysis of the similarities and differences existing between James' Isabel Archer and Eliot's Gwendolen Barish. Lewis claims that James' *The Portrait of a Lady* would not have been written had he not read Eliot's "Gwendolen Barish"--what he calls the "good part of Daniel Deronda." Refutes Virginia Woolf's complaint that Eliot's story is "too slow and cumbersome for comedy" and that her "solid upon dialogue is too much" by examining what he calls the "narrative position" of her dialogue. Claims that "it is precisely in Gwendolen's speech that she is made a concrete presence. Eliot's on length the differences between James' and Eliot's characterization, pointing out James' inability to produce moral consciousness in his characters. Eliot's characters, however, are forced to change morally because the actions they must take are not free choices but have a sense of guilt attached to them.

Rosen, Kenneth Marston, Jr. "George Eliot and the question of tragic redemption: A Study of Imaginative Sympathy in *The Mill on the Floss* and *Daniel Deronda*." Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1971. 127 pp.

"*The Mill on the Floss* and *Daniel Deronda* are examined together because Edwin Eliver and Gwendolen Barish represent George Eliot's two most comprehensive attempts to focus on the development of a tragic heroine." claims that Eliot incorporated the idea of redemption by means of the narrative strategy of Daniel Deronda:

Schoen, Patricia. "George Eliot's Redemption of Gwendolen: *Daniel Deronda*." in *George Eliot: Essays in Rochester, Eliot, and James*. Jackson, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1976:104-105.

Claims that "the redemption of the meaning of both Deronda and Gwendolen entails a discovery that produces

their own emptiness and enables them to see both self and others in terms of reflective fullness rather than reflected lack. The redemption of meaning, then, sustains the reflective relation of self and world."

Hitchcock, Sally. "Masculinities in the Middle-Class Novel, 1870-1940," in The Rising Novel: Sexuality, Class, and Women's Reading, 1870-1910. Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green University Press, 1981. 48-72.

Examines the childlike characteristics with which Eliot provides Betty Barnet of Adam Bede. Claims that with Betty, Eliot sketched away the "aura of an ideal child-woman" as in fiction; and revealed that she was "not quite a human being." Examines the childlike treatment of Hilda/Margaret. Seen her ill-fated marriage side as an act of defiance against her husband as the result in a miscarriage.

Korczynski, Kathleen. "The Devil and the Hyacinth Garden: Eliot's Hellenomimetic Fiction." Collegiate Essay 23 (1981): 440-414.

Shows the ways in which Eliot's novels illustrate Hellenomimetic's feminist approach. Argues that Eliot, like Hellenomimetic, saw that the contemporary education for girls was lag; unlike Hellenomimetic though, this poor educational system produced not an Angel in the House but, as Eliot shows through Samuel Lytton, it produced an adulteress. Argues that Hellenomimetic's naive attempt over her objection by using any have been a model for Eliot's portrayal of Hilda's failed attempt at dressing in Greek Garb.

Mason, Ellen. LITERARY WOMEN. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1964. 14-47, 41-43, 242-64, 171-73, 184-85, 191-195, 250-52, 267-70, passim.

Examines the influence of women on Eliot's Caroline upon Eliot's heroines in The Mill on the Floss and Hilda/Margaret, claiming that Caroline was one of Eliot's "minor novels by Lady Marylester" and that her reference to it in her work serve as a both inspiration and warning "in its evilness as in its enormous influence upon literary world." Claims that Caroline Marist wants to be a Caroline in that she desires an easy and delightful life. Examines the scene in Daniel Deronda in which Grandison receives the diamond's diamonds on her wedding night. Claims that, due to Grandison's reaction to the Jewess, Hilda is trusting her "deflowered by her husband Grandison" by revealing her "hypocritical, virginal falsity" as well as "Grandison's seductive tactics... secondary marriages, wedding night

customs, and sexual hypocrisy in the Victorian age."

Myers, William. The Teachings of George Eliot. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1961.

Examines the ways in which the theories of philosophers/psychists such as Comte, Kantian, Freud and Lacan coincide with the ideas in Eliot's novels. Some similarities between Gaskell's feelings of love/hate, joy/terror towards Grandcourt and what Freud called the struggle "between Eros and Death." This male-masochistic relationship is evaluated by Gaskell who becomes Gaskell's "conscious super-ego," which, according to Freud, functions as a form of guilt, representing our "externally directed violence." Freud's ideas coincide then with Eliot's ideas about duty, desire, morality, sinfulness, and love of power. Remarks that Eliot places herself both on and against the side of Comte in that Gaskell yields both to spontaneous and ordered submission (a Comtean idea). Examines Betty of *John Hall* in Lacanian terms. Betty's discussion with her own image is a failure to move from the "specular I" or the mirror stage to the "symbolic I" or the symbolic stage. Some similarities between Lacan's developmental stages and Eliot's assessment of Betty's mental development, particularly in her indifference to the other, in her fantasy life, and in her lack of inner tension.

Oliphant, Margaret. Vol. 2 of The Victorian Age of English Literature. New York, 1921 191-178.

Sees Gaskell as David Gaskell as one of Eliot's "most masterly of impersonations," believes that with Elizabeth Gaskell and David Gaskell "the greater simplicity of the earlier method, in which the natural handling of words had some share" failed and "passed into processes of artificial imagination, and imposed utterance." Believes that Gaskell and Gaskell were not truly inspired as were her earlier characters, but were "artificial and bookish embodiments of new philosophy."

Paris, Bernard. "The Inner Conflicts of Maggie Tulliver: A Psychoanalytic Analysis." The Centennial Review 13 (1969): 144-164.

Examines Maggie Tulliver of *The Mill on the Floss* using the psychoanalytic theory of Sigmund Freud. Examines two ways in which Maggie responds when she is placed in a situation where she is, due to her own neurotic needs, unable to be treated with love and respect. Examines Maggie's reactions in light of Freud's three defensive strategies: the superego, the ego, and the id. Examines the superego, the ego, and the id. Examines the

those strategies through examples from the text. Reppin withdraws into a world of books and daydreams "to escape the real, unsatisfactory people around her." She seeks a "sense of safety and worth through mystery and recognition." Her aggressive behavior is revealed most clearly in her relationship with her mother and her work. Reppin sees through her fear of Tom's rejection "because it leaves her feeling alone and helpless in a hostile world."

Ball, Henry. "The Fathers' Daughters in Social Novels." Eighteenth-Century Fiction 24 (1981): 404-431.

Argues that Social Novels explore "the difficulties of the daughter in achieving cultural and social legitimacy within an oppressive, if not actually menacing, patriarchal society." Examines the influences which the "evil fathers" in the novel have over their daughters and claims that novels as a "great art"/father figure to Germaine de Staël because "his entire support ... of poetic fables ... is essentially the idealization of a patriarchal religion." Claims that Eliot, while granting "spiritual and cultured legitimacy to the mother's work," has "revisited the limitations within which the struggle to achieve personal legitimacy takes on for the fathers' daughters."

Petrelli, Marc B. "The Importance of Being Queendish: Contexts for George Eliot's *Social Novels*." Studies in the Novels of George Eliot (1981): 31-40.

Examines aspects of Germaine de Staël's personality in light of other literary "Queendoms," citing Scott's "Queendish," James Fenn's "Queendish," Spencer's "Queendish" from *The Fairies* among other anonymous authors who have created "Queendoms." Examines these heroines and the way in which they are similar to or different from Eliot's heroine in terms of her aspiring "education" and power. Concludes that Eliot's "Queendish" extends "both intellectual desire of power and discovery through her attempt to live like a vision that is beyond romantic desire." In this way, she is like the "Queendish" of the American legend who finds happiness in blowing others, and, like Scott's "Queendish," she learns that the desire to have power renders her powerless.

Qualls, Harry V. "Speaking Through Fictions: Social Novels." In *George Eliot*. Edited by Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1980: 200-221.

Analyzes Social Novels as fictional processes and parables. Claims that the novel questions the place of art, fiction, and music in one's life and that Eliot proposes

that the source of art is in the religious myth that sets up people's consciences. The novel's characters, except for Grandcourt, seek historic and symbolic situations in order to shed understanding on their lives.

Kaine, Adri. "Daniel Deronda: A View of Grandcourt." Studies in the Novel 17 (1985): 191-200.

Examines the "myriadness of Daniel Deronda's presentation." Claims that the interaction between Grandcourt and Deronda illustrates Eliot's conception of Schopenhauer's determinism. Eliot's philosophy of willfulness is presented in Deronda's, who is a "greated presence," whereas Deronda is a "philosophical postulate."

Kingler, Ellen. "Middlemarch: A Feminist Perspective." Studies in the Novel 15 (1983): 51-61.

Examines the awareness concerning feminist issues felt by Eliot's female contemporaries as well as twentieth-century feminists as they apply to Middlemarch. Defines the modern feminists' claim that women's is unsuccessful, uncreative, and is just a failure due to her "physical and social apathy" by examining Deronda's psychological strength which prevails over men, then focuses on the "other" for feminism, whose influence is "social and spiritual-private, rather than public." Claims that the role of women's in Middlemarch is broken because women's public role is in no way as powerful as their personal force and influence.

Kobertson, Linda E. "George Eliot's Ideas on Education." Ph.D. dissertation. University of Arkansas, 1981, 189pp.

Examines various attitudes Eliot's male characters have toward the education of female characters in her novels as well as the reasons why these female characters pursue an "education." Claims that Emma, Deronda, and Deronda's sisters all increase their education to be more useful to the fathers, husbands, or male confidants in Deronda's camp in their lives.

Kobman, Carla. "The Brave Angels: A Study of Daniel Deronda." English Literary History 31 (1964): 179-200.

Is critical of Eliot's portrayal of Deronda as one of either intellectuals who are born "either a little [illegible], or else a little conservative." Argues that Deronda merges both philosophies and therefore is not a character but "the embodiment of a compromise." Claims that Deronda is

Beronda's moral superior, an innocent "wretch" to his brilliant Baker-like character as she is capable of love and hate, despair and victim, and is fully engaged in dilemma while Beronda has none of these qualities. Interprets the Beronda-Denardian relationship as a secular transformation of the Christian message of redemption. While Beronda finds as a "Christ wholly human" to whom Denardian looks, Denard looks for his own "savior" in Beronda.

note, Jacqueline, "George Eliot and the Spectacle of the Woman." In Sexuality in the Field of Vision. London: Verso, 1989:101-12.

Using Lacanian ideas of the split and the gaze, this article examines the ideas of intentionality, spectacle, and desire in Emma's Daniel Beronda. Explores Wendell's look in Beronda's drawing as one associated with spectacle, judgment, and desiring. As Wendell appears before Beronda after Beronda's drawing, she also looks as though she were dead--"pale like one of the stained dead." Claims that she does not kill him, but she does not save him, therefore, the question of responsibility is left "in suspense." Also claims that the woman's "place of desire" receives its meaning from "the glance of the male spectator." Claims that the male gaze takes Eliot's heroine the privileged subject of investigation and control, giving Beronda's judgmental judgmental glance at Wendell posing as an example. Also claims that this scene indicates that Beronda is blaming Wendell for producing desire in him that is, Beronda the spectator is blaming Wendell for being the spectacle. Claims that because she is already placed into the category of female sexuality, Denardian and her actions are constituted as disturbance. She will always be judged as a troubling spectacle because of her gender. Sees a connection between Beronda's quest to know his heritage and Wendell's asking good on her moral self. Claims that his quest is dependent on her moral self, equating this idea to the claim that the hysteria of the woman is the father of the man. Eliot, as a writer, puts herself "in the periphery of this process." Summarizes the idea of the problematic categorizing of women both as fictional characters and as writers-- to the fact that Eliot asserts herself as neither unequivocally male or female. As a writer without a sexual category, she undercuts the very model of sexual difference.

Jacka, Brian T. "Specter and Moral Judgment in the Novels of George Eliot: The Value of Maria Tarr." Ph.D. dissertation, State University of New York at Stony Brook, 1987, 140 pp.

Examines the differences in moral voices and growth that exist between men and women in Eliot's fiction from *The Mill on the Floss* to *Middlemarch*. Uses the psychoanalytic theory of Carol Gilligan to interpret Eliot "by supplying a language with which to identify the different moral voices in her work." This in turn emphasizes her "masculine" "successes" rather than their "failures" which have traditionally been examined by feminist critics. Explores Warner's development and nondevelopment in this light from *Adam Bede* to *Sanial Gerardo*.

Barrett, Diana. "The Law and the Father." In Monsters of Affection: Dickens, Eliot, and Brooks on Fatherhood. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981. 74-89.

Looks at Douglas Laeder's theories of patriarchy and symbolism and shows how his ideas of father, authority, and law are linked in the mill on the Floss, Adam Bede, and Fanny Hill. Claims that Eliot questions the authority of patriarchal fathers. Believes that Eliot humiliates her figures of authority (fathers, physicians, and others) by making them learn the lesson of sympathy through suffering. Uses the "father-daughter bond (as) an ongoing quest for the Victorian daughter" because "the daughter entering the social order learns she may possess neither father nor father and she will one day be possessed by someone like her father."

---. "The Drama of Seduction." In Monsters of Affection: Dickens, Eliot and Brooks on Fatherhood. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982. 40-72.

Sees Eliot as writing a "family romance" in order to liberate herself from her father and his authority. Looks at early works of fiction as well as *Middlemarch*, finding scenes of seduction "in which desiring father and seductress are created by both father and daughter." Examines the "seduction scenes" in *Sanial Gerardo*. Uses Greenblatt's prehistory of the disaster from the brutal Genocide as her way of writing out an Oedipal desire in which Lydia is a mother figure and Frankfort a father figure.

Goodier, Elaine. "Feminine Masculine: Charlotte Brontë and George Eliot." In A Literature of Their Own: British Women Novels from 1838 to 1860. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1971. 180-188.

Looks at Eliot's life as well as her works. Claims that her self-imposed exile from her friends, her greatness as a

literary figures, and the personal attention she received from both James and later her young husband Cyrene all excluded and made obvious her female contemporaries. Others on extensive examination of Maggie of the Mill on the Floss, looking at her low self esteem as compared to Tom's self righteousness. Examines the fear the insecurity that Maggie and Philip Weston feel about their sexual identities and vision that this fear is what brings them together. When she does feel sexually attracted to Stephen Guest, she has no vocabulary for the emotion except to call it "love". Because she does not understand or perceive her pain, her struggles and emotions escape by means of a real and lethal flood.

---. "The Drowning of Sister George." Nineteenth-Century Fiction 18 (1983): 194-201.

Offers an extensive view of Eliot's female contemporaries and their various attitudes towards her success and reputation as a novelist. Claims that not until Virginia Woolf, who saw the greatness of her heroines' "heavenly rebellion" as a reflection of Eliot's own "troubled and haunting greatness," was she taken seriously as a literary success. Deals with Eliot's "growing" as a literary tradition "after a period of wry decline" and examines the problems modern feminists continue to find in Eliot's novels. Suggests that the reason feminist critics have reacted with such disappointment to Eliot's novels is that "they have made the same vocational and herited mistakes themselves." Moreover, Eliot does not "understand but prefigures a female success, one who fulfills the promise of a new spiritual creation. Examines women novelists and feminist critics who have either rewritten Eliot's plots or continue either to praise her heroines or quarrel over them, making her an "attractive sister whose conflicts and choices prefigure modern women's emergent selves." Among these are Simone de Beauvoir, Margaret Graham, Gill Gilpin, Kate Millett, and P.D. James.

Harwood, Katherine K. "Evangelical doctrine and George Eliot's *Harriet in Middlemarch*." The Victorian 1, Winter 7 (1981): 18-26.

Examines the ways in which evangelical religion "informs Eliot's imaginative vision," particularly in *Middlemarch*. "The most secular of all her works," claims that evangelism does not have an external influence on Eliot's fiction but instead reveals the internal struggles of ordinary people. Shows how Eliot in *Middlemarch* "expresses the basic tenets of evangelical belief" by revealing that all people are flawed, that the human character can be saved, and that we all have a moral order

in daily life to which we should aspire.

Simons, Edith, "George Eliot," The Nineteenth Century 3 (1881): 734-401.

A personal account of both "George Eliot" and her works written shortly after her death. Makes reference to the ways in which she and Lewis both influenced one another's works and to the amount of "passionate and romantic worship" she received from her readers. Simons claims that in *Amelia*, *Felix Holt*, and "The Spanish Gypsy", Eliot provided her heroines with a wider world than they in order to give purpose to their lives which had missed out on private good. Admits that in her works, Eliot emphasized the importance of duties over the assertion of rights for both men and women and emphasized the importance of moral qualities over intellectual qualities for women.

---. "Middleness." In A Century of George Eliot criticism. Edited by Gordon Knight. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961: 73-88.

Reprint of an 1875 review of *Middleness* by one of Eliot's closest friends and contemporaries. Claims that the novel is Eliot's greatest work and that it has "an almost oppressive effect on ordinary readers...[for] it is not unusual to wish men to know as much of their fellow-creatures as George Eliot shows them." Reminiscent Goethe's *Die Wahlverwandtschaften* as one that is "altogether in the nature and constitution of the universe" and claims that her "beautiful intentions" are based on an illusion "because there is no right place for their husband." Quotes the very failure in the novel to the "inequality...of ...the reformation of [her own] society."

Stephen, Leslie, "George Eliot," In A Century of George Eliot criticism. Edited by Gordon Knight. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961: 130-148.

Reprint of an 1881 article from the Cornhill Magazine. Claims that Eliot's favorite theme was the woman in need of a confessor, referring specifically to *Scandalous* in *David Grieve*, who, he claims, was able to see past clearly that because the fact that she indeed needed him as her confessor. Revises that even in her failure, *Scandalous* has "the lofty air of martyrdom." Very critical of the worthiness of *Scandalous's* aspirations in *Middleness* and of her judgment in choosing *Scandalous* as a husband in the first place. A very observant critique of *Middleness*, concluding that women's failures in the novel merely prove the fact that women cannot "find a worthier sphere of action."

than the mere working of ideas."

Williams, William F. "George Eliot and Gaskell's *Fanshawe*." *George Eliot Fellowship Review* 4 (1974): 15-22.

Looks at the similarities that exist between Gaskell's *Fanshawe* and Eliot's novels. Claims that Eliot drew upon the sentimental aspects of Gaskell's sketches to create Mirah Leghish of *Daniel Deronda* and Betty Farnel of *Adam Bede*. Notes that Mirah's is a character more in keeping with G.E. Lewis's description of Gaskell: a "peculiar union of passion, simplicity, loneliness, and witchery." Also notes that Eliot takes several specific elements to heart in *Daniel Deronda*. The most striking is Gwendolen Harleth's "ill-considered quotation of Hegel's philosophy" which she uses to describe Mrs. Ardenquith: "Long on pleasure, short on business."

Woods, Helen "George Eliot's *Household Jew*, or, *The Novel as Outdoor Temple*." *Novels: A Forum on Fiction* 4 (1974): 31-32.

Argues that *Household Jew* is the "outdoor temple" Eliot wished to create, referring to an 1842 letter in which she describes an "outdoor temple" as "a place where human beings do not rush apart but meet with common inquiries." Claims that the novel is sentimental in the best that it deals with the "clashing of Jew and Gentile, of Gerasa as personal reformer and social critic, of male and female." Claims that while Gerasa posited an overtly masculine role of dominator, Harleth represents the inclusive human nature that she has denied and at the same time is "completely consumed" by Gerasa's despair. Claims that this "consumption" does not make him "less of a man but more of a human being." Claims that the two halves of the novel come together when Gerasa's overcomes her anxiety when forced to take responsibility and when Deronda embraces his "alliance" by adopting his mission to attempt to restore the Jew.

Taylor, Inc. *George Eliot: A Study of Individualism*. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1949.

The most recent biography of Eliot. Examines her life, primarily, in the way that her gender affected her life as a writer, a lover/"wife" to Lewis, and as a wife to Cross. Looks at her friendships with other women, particularly strong contemporary feminists such as Barbara Bodichon and George Parker. Notes that her marriage to Cross caused many problems for Cross due to her reputation. Claims that Cross was prone to excited thoughts before he married Marian and

that the progress of her farm was so much for him that he attempted suicide-- but failed in the attempt-- during their honeymoon.

Thomas, Jeanie. "An Inconvenient Individualism: George Eliot, William George, and Feminism." *University of Toronto Quarterly* 36 (1967): 382-415.

Refutes feminist arguments made by Ellen Douglas and Lee Edwards who claim that Eliot does not allow her heroines to do better things with their lives. Suggests that the reason for their discontent lies in "the feminist urgency about female economic choices," claims, in fact, that, contrary, is marriage. "has discovered a personal definition in the unexpected demands of that role" and that in her personal choice to marry Gaskell, she makes a political statement. Claims that Eliot believed that equality of opportunity for women could only be won at the expense of her 'harshness of sympathy for others.' Explains the ways in which Henry Thackeray and Sarah Milligan's theories enabled a stilled position, claiming that a woman's autonomous life of work is not necessarily better than a life of 'interdependence, consisting of love and work. Claims that Eliot's works are indeed feminist statements in the fact that they "[preserve] and [extend] the web of connections between female beings, men and women, while evoking some agonious rules for both sexes."

Thomas, Patricia. "The Two Georges." In *George Sand and the Victorians: Her Influence and Reception in Nineteenth-Century England*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1971. 150-64.

Reveals the similarities existing between the French George Sand and the English George Eliot. Examines the ways in which Sand influenced Eliot in her personal as well as her literary life, claiming that Sand's lifestyle aided Eliot in her decision to live with Lewis. Suggests that Eliot's choice of the common pseudonyms would invite comparison with the already famous Sand. Claims that Sand fostered the emotional, idealistic side of Eliot's writing and points to other positive influences but contends that Eliot was "capable of writing...very much greater works."

Witt, Judith. "'The World Come Back': The Fathers of Daughters in Social Satire." *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 42 (1987): 315-336.

A psychological study of Elizabeth Barrett's history with father figures, husbands, and stepfathers. The study connects her relationship to these men with her

unwillingness to save Grandcourt from drowning. Examines other fathers and father figures in the novel whom children, specifically Miriam Lapidash, Isabel Curzon, Leonora Chislet, and Grandcourt all fear that these fathers would soon kill.

Woolf, Virginia. "George Eliot." In *The Common Reader*. Edited by Andrew McNeillie. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1969: 142-72.

Examines Eliot's life as a female writer, claiming that although she experienced some difficulties early on her life her later life became to her "a stepped ascension" which "brings it down our pity." Examines Eliot for her realistic portrayal of women's lives, and the ways with which her readers understand their "common" problems. Asserts that "George Eliot asked to share their lives, not in a spirit of condemnation or of curiosity, but in a spirit of sympathy. She is an artist, her style is too slow and cumbersome to lend itself to comedy." States that her earlier novels contain "passions, the only passions that George Eliot allowed herself-- the passions of the past" but that her later works are "nature," citing the "nature Novels," the serialized book which with all its imperfections is one of the few English novels written for grown-up people." Claims that George Eliot's heroine's are George Eliot for "they bring out the worst of her, lead her into difficult places, make her self-conscious, didactic, and occasionally vulgar. Examines Eliot's controversial endings, which are struggling ending in tragedy or scholarly compromise and are also the "complete denial of the story of George Eliot herself. For her, too, the beauty and complexity of womanhood can not enough." She must reach beyond the ordinary and pluck for herself strange bright fruits of art and knowledge." Examines Eliot for "confronting her feminine aspirations with the real world of men."

Yarnall, Ruth. "Fictional Heroines and Feminist Critique." In *Novels & Women as Fiction* : (1974): 29-38.

Examines feminist critics' responses to fictional heroines who claim that we can learn in fiction "truthfully, allegorically, symbolically, but never realistically--as fully rounded, complex human beings." Claims that this kind of feminist criticism is dangerous because "it fails to distinguish between life and art" and sees events--such as marriage--not only as misdeeds but as metaphors. Looks at novels such as *Madame Bovary* and *The Portrait of a Lady* among others in this way. Claims that the error for the feminist critic "lies in conflating life and art, in viewing latter tyrannously as if she were a real woman."

Hin, Hsueh. "Distorted Perceptions in Daniel Deronda." Essays in Criticism 34 (1984): 229-234.

Looks the character of Mirra on Eliot's attempt to assess the capacity of both emotion and thought. Draws parallels between the Judean theme in Daniel Deronda and Eliot's 1876 essay "The Modern Novel Regi Regi". Associates Eliot's use of the metaphors of light and vision with perception and understanding.

Husselman, Susan. "Felix Holt and the True Power of Goodness." English Literary History 54 (1987): 433-441.

Looks at the ways in which Felix Holt expresses the negative effects of female power. Claims that Eliot responds to women's oppression by encouraging them to develop their ideal virtues of womanhood. In this, like their true power. Claims that Eliot sees ignorance as the source of women's excessive and harmful power and therefore advocates the education of women.

---. "Overdone Verities and 'The Girl of the Period'." In George Eliot, Sensory Essays and an Unpublished Fragment. Edited by Anne Davis. London: Barnes & Noble Books, 1987. 134-138.

Examines descriptions of Daniel Deronda within the framework of sensation novelist Eliza Lynn Linton who created a typical heroine named "the girl of the period". The antithesis of the "Angel in the House," "the girl of the period" was no longer a purely feminine woman; she discarded the "traditional female virtues of submissiveness, dependency, and maternal love in exchange for disturbing independence, free sexuality, self-assertion and power. Claims that Eliot used "the girl of the period" motif to warn her readers away from the feminist's "obnoxious call for equality and toward her own vision of moral evolution." Examines the ways in which Eliot's description as "the girl of the period" was "suspicious" or sexually cold, placing much of the blame on Deronda's refusal to acknowledge male authority.

---. "'Refined as a Diamond': George Eliot, Jewelry and the Female Role." Criticism 35 (1993): 413-48.

Examines the use of jewelry or what Eliot called "ornaments" in her fiction. Looks at the ways in which jewelry serves as a metaphor which enables Eliot to contrast the role of women as a vein, epistle, and vessel "object" with her role as wife and mother. Claims that the role of womanhood's jewelry in Daniel Deronda is to show her

spiritual development, where she moves from a desire for power and mastery at the gambling table to a "spiritual bondage" when she must wear Igloo Gasher's diamond.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott, Rosemary. George Eliot. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Austin, Helen. "My Feminist critics are Angry with George Eliot." College English 33 (1974): 549-61.
- Barr, William. George Eliot. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984.
- Beveridge, Alice and Roger Kennedy. The Works of George Eliot: An Introduction. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1984.
- Brown, Joseph. "The Redefinition of the Greek Free 'Jewel's Repentance' to John Holt." Nineteenth-Century Fiction 18 (1983): 168-72.
- Cassidy, Denise. "Women of Clerical Life: The First Experiment." In The Lives of an Englishwoman: Dickens, Thackeray, and George Eliot at Midwinter. Athens: The University of Athens Press, 1961. 248-267.
- Carroll, David. "George Eliot: the myth of Berlin." Studies in the Novel (1973): 14-45.
- Charleston, W. A. The Victorian Age in Literature. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1948.
- Cross, F.W. George Eliot's Life as Related in Her Life and Letters. 2 vols. London: Blackwood and Sons, 1888.
- Eliot, George. Middlemarch. New York: Viking Penguin Inc., 1947.
- . Essays of George Eliot. Ed. Thomas Pinney. New York:

Columbia University Press, 1961.

---, "Was I Born to Write Fiction?" From The George Eliot Letters. Ed. Gordon S. Knight. Vol. II, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964.

---, The George Eliot Letters. 2 vols. Ed. Gordon S. Knight. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964.

---, Aspects of Classical Life. New York: Viking Press, Inc., 1966.

---, Selections from George Eliot's Letters. Ed. Gordon S. Knight. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967.

"The English Law of Success." The Westminster Review 1856. 612-61.

Sachs, John. "Adam Bede." In Critical Essays on George Eliot. Ed. Barbara Hardy. London: Longmans & Co., 1974.

Silbert, Sandra and Susan Sahr. "George Eliot: The Angel of Destruction." In The Madonna in the Mill: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978.

Sahr, Susan. "'The Black Page' and the Issues of Female Creativity." Critical Inquiry 10 (1984): 243-65.

Knight, Gordon S. George Eliot: A Biography. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.

---, George Eliot and John Chapman: with John Chapman's Letters. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.

Salpeter, John. "George Eliot." In English and Self-Discovery in

the Victorian Novel: Studies in the School of Dickens in the Nineteenth Century. New York: Kurt Franklin, 1914, 120-22.

Bardy, Richard, J. Willis Miller & Edward Folsler. "Middlemarch. Chapter 44: Three Commentaries." Nineteenth Century Fiction 10 (1940): 451-55.

Boughton, W.B. The Victorian Sense of Mind, 1819-1870. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947.

Brookhouser, G.A. George Eliot's Early Years. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1944.

Bracegirdle, Felix. The Victorian Reader. Ed. David Hall. New York: Columbia University Press, 1944.

Carson, Jacques. Forster & Schelling. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1937.

---. Freudian Symbolism. Eds. Julius Mitchell and Jacqueline Ross. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1961.

---. The Four Psychoanalytical Concepts of Psycho-Analysis. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1961.

---. The Reader of Jacques Lacan: The Two in Freud's Theory and in the Technique of Psychoanalysis. Ed. Jacques-Alexis Miller. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1968.

---. The Reader of Jacques Lacan: Freud's Passage to Technique. Ed. Jacques-Alexis Miller. W.W. Norton & Company, 1968.

"A 'Last' out of the Bishop's Book." The Reader 1964: 677-84.

- Lowie, P.R. The Great Traveller: George Eliot, Henry James, Joseph Conrad. New York: New York University Press, 1961.
 "Literature." The Leader 1994: 474.
- Myers, William. The Travels of George Eliot. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1984.
- Reis, Thomas. George Eliot's "Sense of Christian Life". New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965.
- Ricott, Charles S. George Eliot: Home and People from Her Exile. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1918.
- Slipant, Margaret. Vol. 2 of The Victorian Age of English Literature. New York: Good, and Company, 1961.
- Perle, Bernard. Experiments in Life: George Eliot's Career for Tolson. Ithaca: Cornell State University Press, 1965.
- Pollock, Arthur. George Eliot's Family Life and Letters. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1928.
- England-Sullivan, Ellis. "The Social Movement." In Life and the Subject of George Eliot. Eds. Ellis England-Sullivan and Mark Bracher. New York: Routledge, 1991: 48-61.
- Redinger, Mary. George Eliot: The Emergent Self. London: Bodley Head, 1979.
- Ross, Jacqueline. "George Eliot and the Spectacle of the Woman." In Sexuality in the Field of Vision. London: Verso, 1988: 184-22.
- "Scott's Lectures." The Leader 1994: 418-47.
- Shakespeare, Shakes. An Angel's Portrait for the Great Roman. Unpublished. New York: New York University Press, 1988.

The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary Oxford: Clarendon Press,
1936.

"Sixty Novels by Lady Novellists." The Westminster Review 1794
443-45.

Simcox, Edith. "George Eliot." The Nineteenth Century 2 (1884):
718-821.

"sympathy." Oxford English Dictionary 1936 28.

Taylor, Ida. George Eliot's A House of Unrest. New York:
William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1919.

Thomas, Jessie. "An Incomplete Indefiniteness: George Eliot,
Nicholas, and Fanny" 24 (1907): 383-413.

"Three Novels." The Leader 1894: 143.

Whitely. The Leader 1894: 898-99.

Wilde, (George Henry Lewis) "Eastern Festivities." The
Leader 1894: 388.

---. "Wilde at the Water Cure." The Leader 1894: 447-48.

---. "Wilde's Medical." The Leader 1893: 944.

Wells, Virginia. "George Eliot." In The Common Reader.
Ed. Andrew McNeillie. New York: Harcourt Brace
Jovanovich, 1964. 147-72.

Wink, Henry. "Looking West." Quaker 20 (1889): 21-24.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Kathleen Lynn Roth is originally from Shippensburg, Pennsylvania. Both her mother and father are teachers. She received her Bachelor of Arts degree in Spanish and English in 1964 from Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania. She worked at Shippensburg University as a teaching assistant of developmental writing while completing her Master of Arts degree in English, which she received in 1968. She worked as a research assistant and teaching assistant throughout her doctoral program at the University of Florida. In the spring of 1970, she presented a paper on *Lesen und Schreiben* at the University of Paris VIII at a conference in Paris, France. In 1973, she was awarded a Research Distribution Fellowship by the University of Florida. Her areas of academic interest are in nineteenth century British literature, especially the Victorian novel, and psychoanalytic and French feminist theory. She has reviewed composition textbooks for Houghton Mifflin Company and for Harper Collins publishing. She is currently an instructor of English at the University of Alabama.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in a scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.


Patricia Crockett, Chair
Professor of English

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in a scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.


Elizabeth Langford
Professor of English

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in a scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.


Chris Goodgrass
Associate Professor of English

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in a scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.


Suzanne Fortin
Professor of English

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.


Harold Wilson
Associate Professor of History

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the Department of English in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and to the Graduate School and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

December, 1949

Dean, Graduate School